THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

VOL. XL, No. 2 APRIL, 1933

Knowing the Lord as Savior
EVERETT KING BRAY 65

Swedenborg's Use of Scripture for Doctrine (I)
WILLIAM FREDERICK WUNSCH 78

Swedenborg and Masonry
EDWIN S. CRANDON 88

"The New Church in the New World" [A Review of a book by Marguerite Beck Block]
LEWIS FIELD HITE 103

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The REVIEW aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, the Rev. William F. Wunsch (in charge of "Studies") and Mr. B. A. Whittemore (in charge of "Current Literature"); with the Rev. H. Clinton Hay in an advisory capacity.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON.

50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. $2.00 A YEAR

(Postage to Canada 8 Cents, and to Europe 16 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter (Printed in U.S.A.)

OFFICERS OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF THE NEW JERUSALEM.—

President, Rev. Fred Sidney Mayer, 3812 Barrington Road, Baltimore, Md.; *Vice-President*, Mr. Ezra Hyde Alden, 1419 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.; *Secretary*, Mr. B. A. Whittemore, 134 Bowdoin Street, Boston 9, Mass.; *Treasurer*, Mr. Albert P. Carter, 511 Barristers Hall, Boston, Mass.

THE
NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XL] APRIL, 1933 [No. 2

KNOWING THE LORD AS SAVIOR

BY THE REV. EVERETT KING BRAY

WHILE we study the life of our Lord Jesus Christ, from the Word as unfolded by the Doctrines, during the time in which the glorification was still in process, we find the infinite Love within Him drawing very near to us, and we gratefully rejoice in experience of the great truth that seeing Him is seeing the Father. But with the arrival at the period of "the ascension," thinking of Him now as fully God, from inmosts to very outmosts, we may have come to a question-mark. Recalling, from some philosophical and metaphysical reflections, that God in Himself is Infinite, and as such cannot possibly be seen, or even mentally visualized by a finite eye and mind, it is possible for one to wonder if Jesus as the Infinite God could any longer be knowable, or definitely perceivable, as He had been, while still in part merely human. And associating with this the New-Church teaching that God, or the Lord, appears as "the Sun of heaven," we may, instead of having really found God, really lose the Lord Jesus Christ. This is possible, even in the New Church, which has as its charter that it shall worship the Lord Jesus Christ, and Him only.

The Doctrines for this New Church are at great pains, however, to prevent this calamity. The purpose of this paper is to study the teachings upon how we should think of the Lord Jesus Christ now.

In the first place, let us have a word about "the Sun of heaven." We are distinctly warned that, although for brevity and in accommodation to appearances the Lord is sometimes spoken of as "the Sun of Heaven," the fact is that the Lord is *in* the spiritual sun, and is not that sun itself; and that it is the heat of His Love and the light of His Wisdom which, as they radiate from Him toward His human creatures, have the appearance of the Sun; and that such is the heat of His Love and the light of His Wisdom that from Him as from a sun come all the heat and the light of the heavens; indeed, all the inner heat and light of men. (Divine Love and Wisdom, nn. 93-102.) So when it is said of Him, even in the flesh, "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men," the "true Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world," although "the darkness comprehended it not" (Jn. 1:4, 5, 9), the Word is showing how, even then, He was spiritually "the sun" of the souls of angels and of men. And it is in illustration of this soul-warning and mind-illuminating character of the Life which was the Lord that, when the spiritual eyes of the three upon the mount were opened, "His face shone as the sun, and His raiment was white as the light" (Mtt. 17:2). We do not have to move away from the Lord Jesus Christ, then, to see Him as "the sun of heaven"; nor do we have to remove Him away from us, to see Him so. No more than did Peter, James, and John upon the mount.

We want to keep in mind that distance, in the spiritual world, is a matter of appearance, based on differences of state, or degrees of goodness and truth. Therefore, while the normal or average state may be such that the Lord seems distant above Heaven as a sun, there will be times, or states, in which He will seem much nearer. As it is with men in this life, so will it be with them as angels in the other life. There will be times of "drawing near to the Lord"; and then He will not appear as a "Sun," but as the "Divine Human," as "the Lord Jesus Christ," even as He appeared upon the mount to the privileged three. That "this was the Divine

Human" is definitely declared in "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 3212. This is the Human that He put on over the natural human.

Let us turn a moment to the bearing of the Lord's work while in this world, upon this matter. Consider that "it was with view to the conjunction of Divine Good with scientifics and sensuous truths [which are "scarcely anything but fallacies"], and to the salvation of man thereby, that the Lord came into the world; for without the Lord's Human made Divine, there could not have been any conjunction; but by Him conjunction is effected (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 2554). And "it is the Lord's Divine-Human which illuminates both the sight and the understanding of the spiritual, which would not be the case had not the Lord united the Human Essence to the Divine; and unless this had been effected, neither man in the world nor spiritual angels in heaven would have had any intellectual and perceptive principle of good and of truth, neither . . . of blessedness and happiness, consequently nothing of salvation (ibid., n. 2776).

And, looking at the continuing necessity of the Divine Human, note this passage: "What is Divine is incomprehensible, being above every understanding, even that of the angels; nevertheless this Divine, which in itself is incomprehensible, by means of the Lord's Divine Human is capable of flowing into the rational principle of man, and in this case it is received there according to the truths which are therein —consequently in a different manner with different persons. In proportion, therefore, as truths with man are more genuine [and more numerous], in the same proportion also the Divine which flows in is more perfectly received, and in the same proportion man's intellectual principle is enlightened (ibid., n. 2531). Therefore it can be seen that, "the Lord in the union of His Human Essence with His Divine looked to the conjunction of Himself with mankind; and that this was His end, and this His love, which was of such a nature that the salvation of mankind, seen in His union with His Father, caused in Him the inmost joy" (ibid., n. 2034). Accordingly, rejection of the salvation He wrought to bestow

must have caused His deepest sorrow. In connection with this, a look is taken back into the state of human life which necessitated redemption, and we read: "After all the celestial principle in man was lost, that is, all love to God, so that there remained no longer any will to what was good, the human race was separated from the Divine, since nothing joins them together but love; and when there was no love disjunction took place, the consequence of which is destruction and extirpation. . . . Then the Lord came. . . . When the Humanity was made Divine, and the Divinity Human, in the Lord, then the influx of the Infinite or Supreme Divinity had placed with man—which could never otherwise have existed. Hence also there was a dispersion of the direful persuasions of falsity, and of the direful lusts of evil, with which the world of spirits was overcharged, and was continually overcharging more and more, in consequence of the souls that were continually collecting in it from this world; [for then] they who were in those evils and falsities were cast into the hells, and thus were separated. Unless such a dispersion had been effected, mankind must have totally perished, they being governed by spirits, from the Lord. Nor was there any other method of effecting such dispersion, as no operation of the Divine upon man's internal sensuous principles was practicable through the rational principle, this principle being far beneath the Supreme Divine *not* united with the Human" (ibid., n. 2034).

We are assured that "the state of the church was completely changed by the Lord's becoming the Word in ultimates." For "all the churches that had existed before His advent were representative churches, and could see Divine truth in the shade only; but after the Lord's coming into the world a church was instituted by Him that saw Divine truth in the light. The difference is like that between evening and morning, and the state of the church before His advent is also called 'the evening,' and that of the church after it 'the morning.' Before His coming into the world the Lord was indeed present with the men of the church, but mediately

through heaven; whereas since His coming into the world He is present with them immediately, for in the world He put on the Divine Natural, in which He is present with men. [For] The glorification of the Lord is the glorification of His Human that He assumed in the world; and the Lord's glorified Human [generally spoken of as 'the Divine Human'] is the Divine Natural." (Doctrine of Sacred Scripture, n. 99.)

In "True Christian Religion," the last work published by Swedenborg, this passage is repeated, and strengthened by the addition which we now give. He says: "The truth of this is evident from the fact that the Lord rose from the tomb with the whole of the body that He had in the world, leave nothing in the tomb, and therefore took with Him from the tomb the Natural Human itself from the firsts to the lasts of it. . . . This makes it clear that by means of His glorification His natural body was made Divine. Therefore Paul says: That in Christ dwelleth all the fulness of Divinity bodily (Col. 2:9); and John: That Jesus Christ the Son of God is the true God (I John v. 20). From all this the angels are aware that in the whole spiritual world the Lord alone is complete Man" (True Christian Religion, n. 109). We are told not to think of this glorified Body as now being material, neither spiritual in substance as the bodies of angels are, but as being Divine Substance (Doctrine of the Lord, nn. 29-36). For "from the beginning God was Man in First Principles and not in Ultimates; but after He had assumed the Human in the world He became Man in Ultimates also" (ibid., n. 36).

We are distinctly told, furthermore, that although the Lord in His Infinite and invisible inmost, or Esse, is Infinite Divine Love and Wisdom, He nevertheless appears, at times visibly, in Human form, a man, sometimes in the midst of the Sun, sometimes out of the sun but near it, sometimes near by, and sometimes in the midst of angels. (See Heaven and Hell, nn. 52, 55, 79, 121; Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 97, also see 233-234.) And Swedenborg declares that the

Lord manifested Himself before him at the time he (Swedenborg) received his call to the sacred office of revelator for the New Church (True Christian Religion, n. 779). He writes of that experience that he is convinced that it was that very One on Whose breast John the beloved disciple leaned at the last Supper. (See Document 246, and Spiritual Diary.)

The necessity of thinking only of the Lord Jesus Christ as the One God is shown most clearly in numerous places in the Writings, the following statement being specially convincing: "That the Divine in Itself cannot be seen, such as It is in Itself, but such as it is through the Lord in Heaven, may be manifest from this consideration, that no one has seen at any time Jehovah the Father, but when He is seen it is the Lord Who is seen; for the Lord is the very Face of Jehovah. . . . It is said by (or through) the Lord in Heaven, because the Lord is above the Heavens, for He is the Sun of Heaven, but still He is present in the heavens, being the Divine Truth there; and the Divine Truth proceeding from the Lord as a Sun is the Lord in Heaven—on which account the Divine Truth therein is His Face." (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 10579.) It may be helpful to think here of "the Divine Truth there" as the Divine being manifested; for it should be borne in mind in reading such statements, that the Divine Truth is the thinkable, perceptible form of the Divine Good, the Divine Love; and that wherever Divine Truth in its essence or entirety comes to view it is in the Human form that it is seen (ibid., n. 10579). Therefore there is the declaration that the Lord while becoming glorified was the Divine Truth, but that upon completion of glorification He became both the Divine Truth and the Divine Good, so that the Lord (the Lord Jesus Christ) is now the "Divine Love in Human Form." Add to this the statement that "No angel of the heavens ever conceives of the Divine as being in any other than the Human form; and what is remarkable, those in the higher heavens are unable to think of the Divine in any other way. . . . In consequence of this all Heaven acknowl-

edges the Lord, because only in Him does the Divine Human exist. Not only have I been told all this by angels, but when elevated into the inner sphere of Heaven I have been able to perceive it . . . the wiser the angels are the more clearly they perceive this truth; and it is this that enables them to see the Lord." (Heaven and Hell, n. 79.)

We are told that "The sole end of God's Divine Love, when He created the world, was to conjoin man to Himself and Himself to Man, that He might thus dwell with man," and that to render this possible man must have "a knowledge and acknowledgment of one God." Furthermore, it is asserted that this truth was not possessed by even the Most Ancient Church, that both ancient churches worshipped an invisible God, that the Israelitish church "worshipped Jehovah, Who in Himself is invisible, but under a human form . . . put on by means of an angel"; but "this human form was representative of the Lord Who was to come," and therefore *not* Jehovah God Himself. And of the first Christian church the same is essentially true; for it is insisted that though "it did . . . with the lips acknowledge one God, but in three Persons, each one who was singly or by Himself God—thus a divided Trinity but not a Trinity united in one Person—from which an idea of three Gods adhered to their minds, although the expression 'one God' was on their lips," yet all of these are made "invisible because existent in a similar Divine essence before the world was." The conclusion then follows in these emphatic words: *"They still do not know that the one God who is invisible came into the world and assumed a Human, not only that He might redeem men, but also that He might become visible"* (True Christian Religion, n. 786). And since "conjunction with an invisible God is like a conjunction of the eye's vision with the expanse of the universe, the limits of which are invisible; also like vision in mid-ocean, which reaches out into the air and upon the sea and is lost; [and] on the other hand conjunction with a visible God is like beholding a Man in the air or on the sea spreading forth His hands and inviting to

His arms"; therefore it follows that "this New Church is the crown of all the churches that have hitherto existed on the earth, because it is to worship one visible God in Whom is the invisible like the soul in the body" (ibid., n. 787).

With these clear pictures drawn for us of the way in which we who aspire to be of the Lord's New Church must think of the Lord (and the spiritual, for whose salvation His coming was effected, must come to Him by way of thought first, always!) we should be made aware that all terms in the Doctrines respecting Him, which may seem to be abstractions (such as "the Divine," "Divine Love," "Divine Wisdom," "Divine Good," "Divine Truth," "Divine Human," "Divine Natural," etc.) must be conceived in terms of Divine Personality, therefore in the Divine Human form. Of this the Doctrines repeatedly warn us, reminding us that "every man is his own love, and consequently his own good and his own truth, [and that] it is solely from this that a man is a man, and there is nothing else in him that is man" (Doctrine of Sacred Scripture, n. 100); and, that, consequently, good, and truth, and love as such, can only be known in human life. And, so long as our attention is called to it, and we are held from drifting off into mere abstractions, we clearly see that the character of truth has significance only in terms of human thinking, and the quality of love can be known only in human life; thus truth and goodness and affection and love come to focus (to visibility, knowability) always in a human form. "All the good and truth that proceeds from the Lord is in its form a man." The principle is applied to the teaching about the Lord, to keep us from drifting into the fog of abstractions; and repeatedly we are called to reflect upon the declaration of it as applied to Him, in words similar to the following, in the paragraph quoted above about man (Doctrine of Sacred Scripture, n. 100): "And as the Lord is Divine Good and Divine Truth Itself, He is the Man, from Whom every man is a man." The truth of this is apparent in the heavens; for there it is seen that the more an angel is the embodiment of truth

and good, and wisdom and love, the more perfect is his form, the more beautiful his countenance.

When we read, therefore, for example, that "it is the Divine of the Lord that makes heaven" (Heaven and Hell, n. 7), we shall be called upon to put this in terms of the Human form; and when we read elsewhere (as ibid., n. 78) "that this Divine (that makes heaven) is the Lord's Divine Human," we are prepared to see that it is the angels' perception of the Divine Human, of the Divine Man Who is Love: it is this, this "knowing the Lord," the Lord we know as Jesus Christ, that makes heaven to be heaven. For this is "life eternal," to "know" him, Who is very Divine Love Itself in Human form. The Divine of the Lord in heaven is love to Him and charity toward the neighbor" (ibid., nn. 13 and 125).

Is it not significant that Swedenborg, at the beginning of His first great work as revelator for the New Church, the "Arcana Cœlestia" (nn. 14, 15), makes the following statement: "In the following work, by the LORD is solely meant Jesus Christ, the Savior of the world, Who is called the Lord, without other names. He is acknowledged and adored as the Lord throughout all heaven, because He has all power in heaven and earth. He also commanded His disciples so to call Him, when He said, "Ye call Me Lord, and ye say well: for so I am." (John 13:13.) And after His resurrection His disciples called Him Lord. Throughout all heaven they know no other Father than the Lord, because He and the Father are one, as He Himself said "I am the way, the truth, and the life. Philip saith, Lord, show us the Father. Jesus saith unto Him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known Me, Philip? He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father: and how sayest thou, then, Show us the Father?"

And is it not still significant, that, more than twenty-one years later, after continuous instruction and experience under the immediate auspices of the Lord in open converse with the heavens, that, in his last great work, "True Christian

Religion," he should make the similar but amplified declaration of the same great truth, as we have quoted above, to the effect that there is no conjunction with God if He cannot be visualized, and that there is no visualization of Him possible save in His Divine Natural degree, taken on by incarnation, called most frequently in the Writings the Divine Human, but really perceived and known and realized by men on earth and by angels in heaven as "the Lord Jesus Christ"? And is there not inspiration, consolation, and blessed assurance to all who have learned to love Him in the Gospels, and to love Him as their Savior, in the revelator's note in "True Christian Religion," n. 791, that "after this work was finished, the Lord called together His twelve disciples who followed Him in the world; and the next day (June 19, 1770) He sent them all forth throughout the whole spiritual world to preach the Gospel that THE LORD GOD JESUS CHRIST REIGNS, Whose kingdom shall be for ages and ages, according to the prediction in Daniel (7:13, 14), and in the Apocalypse (11:15); also that blessed are those that come to the marriage supper of the Lamb (Apoc. 19:9)? Is not this a most blessed message?

So we do in no sense lose the Lord Jesus Christ, Whom we have learned to love through the Gospels—and in the New Church still more deeply through the unfolding of His work of redemption, at such great cost to Him—because He is now the Almighty God. For in His Glorified Human He is just as near, and just as Personal in His relation to every disciple who turns to Him, as He was when in transfiguration before the disciples upon the mount, and in ascension, and in vision before John in Patmos. He is our Savior still. That it is so the testimony is overwhelming in the Doctrines concerning the Source of our help. Here is a typical passage: "The combats of temptations" "are the means by which evils and falsities are loosened and dispersed in man, and by which horror is excited at the thought of them, and conscience is not only formed, but is also confirmed, and thus man is regenerated. This is the reason that such as are regenerated

are let into combats and undergo temptations—which is effected in the other life if not in the life of the body, with all who are capable of being regenerated. . . . But the Lord alone sustained the most cruel combats of temptation which He underwent, by His own strength, or by His own power: for He was encompassed about by all the hells, and continually overcame them. It is also the Lord alone Who fights and overcomes in men, when they are engaged in the combats of temptation; for man can effect nothing against evil or infernal spirits by his own power, because they cohere with the hells in such a manner that, supposing one to be subdued, another would take up the assault—and so they would go on to eternity. They may be compared to a sea which presses upon every part of a dyke raised to oppose its waves, and which, if it was to make the smallest breach or passage in any part, would never cease to rush through, and would inundate the whole country below its level, till nothing was left above. So would it be with man unless the Lord alone sustained in him the combats of temptations" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1692). "The only refuge from destruction for any one is the Lord" (True Christian Religion, n. 120).

When we pray "Our Father Who art in the heavens," we know, now, that He Who is our Father in Heaven is our Lord Jesus Christ. He is the Father of our life in the rebirth and the regeneration. He is the only Father men or angels will ever know, He is the very Infinite Father clothed in visibility; in His face the Invisible Divine Love and Wisdom Itself comes to view. There we see, and find, and know, and love, all of Deity—all that there is to be seen, and found, and known, and loved by finite souls. Read at "True Christian Religion," nn. 112-113, how the angels who pray the Lord's prayer daily, think of the Divine Human when they say "Our Father."

And He has not gone away. As He said, "I am with you always," He is always our present Helper, Deliverer, Savior, always our Lord, "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today, and forever." Almost like a refrain we find in "True Chris-

tian Religion," the often reiterated name, "The Lord God the Savior Jesus Christ. We can use still the Gospel names, sing the Gospel songs of praise and prayer, to "Jesus," "Savior," "Lord": and lose not one value of the near, dear Personal Presence, that any have felt and been comforted by, who have thought of Him as a separate Person in the Godhead. So we may see Him, calling us today, personally, as He did in Galilee; so we may confess, meaningfully if we realize it: "O Jesus Thou art standing outside the fast closed door, In lowly patience waiting to cross the threshold o'er"; so we may know, "Jesus calls us o'er the tumult of our life's wild, restless sea, saying, Christian follow Me"; and in response we may pray, "Jesus, Savior, pilot me over life's tempestuous sea"; so may pray, letting "blood" stand for all His life-long work of redemption, "Just as I am without one plea, But that Thy blood was shed for me, and that Thou bid'st me come to Thee, O Lamb of God, I come, I come. Just as I am, and waiting not to rid my soul of one dark blot, To Thee Whose blood can cleanse each spot, O Lamb of God, I come, I come; Just as I am—poor, wretched, blind: Sight, riches, healing of the mind, Yea, all I need, in Thee to find, O Lamb of God, I come, I come." Such hymns bring us to the Divine Human—the only where that God abides, the only where that God is found. For we know, as never it has been known, that it is He alone Who rules, and helps, and saves, that THE LORD GOD JESUS CHRIST REIGNS, in Heaven and in earth.

It is time for us to reclaim in the usage of the New Church —for spiritual help in bringing Him near by bringing us in thought near to Him in the only Form that we can know Him in—all the best hymns that confess Him in the terms of Savior, and that help us afresh to envision Him in His redeeming, saving work, in His incomparable outreaching of Love and power.

The greatest mistake that ever was made, was in falling into the thought that the Lord Jesus ever went away. He only became invisible to mere physical sight; for, the eyes

that He was seen with in transfiguration on the mount, and in Patmos, these same eyes of the spirit can see Him now, and will see Him so when we pass to heaven. (See True Christian Religion, n. 777.) Let us cultivate, then, forms of speech in worship that will in Him "bring God near," instead of running the risk of "putting Jesus far away." Let us sing more such hymns as "What a Friend we have in Jesus," "Jesus, Lover of my soul," and many others of like appeal; and let us be in search of others, and let our own song-writers, when they be raised up, remember that "God" cannot be visualized; that only Jesus can make God real—Jesus glorified, of course, but Jesus still, "Jesus the Light of the world," "Jesus the Savior of all who come," "Jesus the First and the Last," Who is "alive forevermore, and has the keys of hell and of death." "The Lord Jesus Christ," say the angels to newcomers, "has heard your prayers."

And how deepened our singing must be as we know Who He is; as we confess that "the spiritual sense of the first commandment is, that no other God than the Lord Jesus Christ is to be worshipped, because He is Jehovah, Who came into the world and wrought the redemption without which neither any man nor any angel could have been saved." (True Christian Religion, n. 294). So unto Him, the only Lord, our souls shall ever look; confession, petition, thanksgiving, praise, to Him shall ever rise—on earth and in heaven. So let us sing:

Jesus, lover of my soul,
Let me to Thy bosom fly . . . .

Plenteous grace with Thee is found,
Grace to cover all my sin:
Let the healing streams abound:
Make and keep me pure within.
Thou of life the fountain art,
Freelyl et me take of Thee:
Spring Thou up within my heart,
Rise to all eternity.

EVERETT K. BRAY.

SWEDENBORG'S USE OF SCRIPTURE FOR DOCTRINE

I. His Pursuit of the Procedure Now Current

By the Rev. William Frederick Wunsch

FEW readers—or students either—seem to have appreciated how differently Swedenborg addresses the Scriptures for different purposes. It has to be conceded that in general there has been little study of any of his methods, whether employed on Scripture or otherwise. Interest has lain in his results. As for his method with Scripture, it is one thing when he is pursuing interpretation of the Word's spiritual sense, another when he is formulating the Bible's teaching in a systematic theology. In the present inquiry we are concerned only with this latter address to the Scriptures. I hope to follow the present article—on "Swedenborg's Pursuit of the Procedure Now Current"—with four others on "The Broad Foundations in Scripture for the Pursuit of the Method," "The Procedure in General," "The Aids to it" and "Our Employment of the Method Uniquely Employed by Swedenborg."

According to his own account, Swedenborg advances no doctrine which is not drawn from Scripture or which can not be drawn from Scripture. Most of us, for our part, give the Word primacy in Christian teaching, and are interested only in a system of teaching which has its source in the Word. It is significant, therefore, and deeply worth while, to see how Swedenborg handles Scripture for theology. Does his method indeed mean that we are getting, and that the world is being offered, the teaching of the Word?

There is more than an academic value in appreciating his procedure and in being able to follow it, if in fact it does consist in drawing doctrine from the Word. We shall then see his results arising from Scripture ourselves, will grasp them as the Bible's teaching, and will refer them, as

he says, to the true fountain of faith. They then become to us a truth imbued with the power of the Word of God. On the other hand, if we only adopt his results in the persuasion that they represent the Bible's teaching, or only because they are said by him to come from the Bible, we hold them as Swedenborgian tenets, in which case they are bereft of the spiritual dynamic and not held with the insight possible. It makes a practical difference whether we grasp and follow his procedure or not. There will be more to say on the point in our concluding paper.

Since Swedenborg's day, that is, since the middle of the eighteenth century, there has been a revolution in the theologian's method of employing Scripture. Indeed, the revolution did not take place until a whole century later. As good a description of it as the present writer knows is to be found in William Newton Clarke's "The Use of the Scriptures in Theology" (1905). It is cause for study and reflection that Swedenborg anticipated this change in method.

In his day and indeed until fairly recently the so-called proof-text method prevailed. Teachings were formulated, whether they were creeds and other official formulations of the Church or the formulations of individual theologians, not afresh from Scripture, but in the context of the accumulated and prevailing teaching of the Church. Prevalent teaching was extended or corrected and reformulated or otherwise dealt with. The assumption was, however, that the teaching which had come to command the mind of the Church rested at least originally on Scripture. For a new departure, even if it involved criticism, as of predestinarian views by free-will teaching, it was sufficient to be able to cite some Scripture in substantiation of it. By logical processes the new teaching was elaborated in the context of the existing body of thought, was then for the first time taken to Scripture, and was buttressed from Scripture. The Bible served as a reservoir of confirmatory texts.

Many reasons and influences led the theologian to abandon this procedure. Not only the specialist but the layman,

too, became uncomfortably aware that texts were available in this fashion for almost any doctrinal view. The procedure was also a form of circular thinking—the theologian was only bringing his own doctrine to Scripture and naturally he came away with that doctrine. It became all too apparent that this was not searching the Scripture for the Scripture's own teaching. One other influence was especially effective in bringing about real research in the Bible for the latter's teaching: that was the influence of the inductive methods of the scientist as these made their way into the theological field. The theologian was influenced to treat the Scripture squarely as the source of teaching. He began to canvass the Bible for all that it offered on a subject, to assemble, evaluate and interpret this material, and out of the digested mass of it to formulate his doctrine. Short of this thorough and painstaking effort, he saw that he might still advance a teaching which indeed reflected some Scriptures, and yet failed to represent the teaching of the Bible as a whole. At the same time the way was cleared for the new procedure as examination of many a traditional view led to a perception of its unscripturalness or, worse still, as in views of the vicarious atonement, to a perception of its outright moral impossibility. As dogmas were questioned and discarded for one reason or another, and in any event could no longer be regarded as the teaching of Scripture, fresh recourse was invited to the Bible for its actual teaching. In these and other ways the current theological method with Scripture sprang up. Briefly, Scripture became, not a storehouse of texts from which one upheld a doctrinal view, but the source of the substance of the teaching. Naturally, of course, doctrine originally drawn from Scripture could be readily substantiated from it and substantiated widely in Scripture—as widely as the subject-matter appears in Old Testament and New.

A century before this alteration of method began, Swedenborg had himself pursued the new and solid way in his Theological Works. That he anticipated many results of thinking in the field of science and in religion, is recognized,

but he is also to be credited with anticipations of truer methods of work.

Still it must probably be granted that Swedenborg's pursuit of the now current theological method with Scripture is not too obvious. There are a number of reasons and very interesting reasons for this.

In the first place, readers do not see him engaged in the preliminary work which the method involves—the assembling of relevant Scriptures and the arriving at their teaching. I think we can say that we do not see Swedenborg at the work of formulating his doctrine from Scripture; in the books he published, he is demonstrating doctrines already formulated. His first doctrinal work, "New Jerusalem and its Heavenly Doctrine," contains little Scripture citation, even. The second, "Four Leading Doctrines" (to group them as one work), contains an abundance of such citation, it is true, but this may be taken and usually probably has been taken to be citation of confirmatory passages, not work in sources. Much the same can be said of the standard résumé of theological teaching, "True Christian Religion," where there is almost constant appeal to Scripture. Perhaps it is more in such unfinished drafts as "Canons" and still more in the little known work, "Scripture Confirmations," that we see Swedenborg originally consulting and working with his biblical sources. As a matter of fact, a similar formulation from sources is going foward in the composition of the "Arcana," from which the first doctrinal work, "New Jerusalem and its Heavenly Doctrine," eventually sprang; but the formulation was mental as well as scattered in the pages of the "Arcana," and only close and alert study discerns it. The general appearance in the doctrinal books, especially to the mind still operating in the proof-text way, is that Swedenborg is citing Scripture for doctrine in the traditional manner. This appearance must be conceded, probably, and it invites the doubt, of course, whether Swedenborg pursued at so early a day the method on Scripture which has now come to command theological effort.

Again, Swedenborg pursued the present method by a kind of second nature. His mode of work in general had always been along the lines of this method. As a scientist and as a philosopher he had always begun with observations of his own or with first-hand observations of others, had assembled his material and evaluated and interpreted it, and only then erected his views and theories on the assembled source-material. What he did in physiology and with the body he did in theology and with Scripture. In his practice the scientific procedure passed over into the field of theology a hundred years before it did so with theologians generally. Had he altered a life-long method, and suddenly brought another into service, we should have been made acutely conscious what this other was. The method long employed by him—a part of his preparation for his work as theologian—continued unchanged, however, and therefore does not arrest our attention.

It is true that Swedenborg states very briefly here and there what the method should be of reaching the Church's teaching. The doctrine of the Church, he says, is to be drawn from Scripture and confirmed thereby. Here are two steps, let it be noted, though only the second has seemed to impress itself upon readers. We may with warrant assume that the procedure so concisely described must be Swedenborg's own procedure, but so far as I know he does not anywhere assert that it is; failing this, the appearance persists for his readers that he has cited Scripture in the text-proof fashion and that this is his Scripture method.

But whatever the appearances, can we assure ourselves what method Swedenborg followed in the use of Scripture for doctrine? Did he pursue the now prevalent procedure? Even if his procedure went beyond this, did it include the current Scripture method?

One large fact immediately confronts us. Swedenborg did forsake the general body of Christian teaching as his base. His teachings are not formulated by logical deduction from or extension of the body of traditional doctrine. He often found the prevailing doctrine erroneous. What

reader is not aware of Swedenborg's adverse criticism of ancient creeds and more recent formularies and of numerous specific doctrines? Such teaching as he did not find erroneous, he might still find inadequate in the light of the Word and for promotion of the spiritual life. He pronounced his adverse criticisms because of this available light and because his eyes were on Scripture, or, as he usually says, on the Word, and again and again he found that the traditional doctrine did not flow from the Bible.

> The dogmas of the present Christian churches have not been formed from the Word, but from self-intelligence, and therefore from falsities, and have also been confirmed by certain passages from the Word. (Part of a sentence in "True Christian Religion," n. 508(4).)
>
> The faith of the present day has destroyed the universal church and falsified the whole Word. (Canons, Trinity, x. 4.)

What procedure is indicated for him in this general outlook on traditional teaching except to pass behind the accumulated body of Christian doctrine and formulate the doctrine anew from the Word?

While Swedenborg does not announce what his own theological method with Scripture is, he does send many a shaft of criticism in the direction of the proof-text method. Does he not imply a criticism of this method in the passage quoted just above from "True Christian Religion"? Is he not criticizing the method further in the following passage?

> Shut up the understanding, bring forth reasonings, and cite proofs from the sense of the letter of the Word, and you will convince yourself of anything you wish, especially in theological matters which ascend into the interiors of the rational mind. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 819 (3e).)

These criticisms fall not only on the specialist, on the "dogmatists" and on the "teachers," to use his own words, but on lay reader and learner as well. Of the former his language grows very strong: "they have hatched a theology out of their skulls, and afterwards consulted the Word" ("Last Judgment," posthumous, n. 55). Readers may not have realized what a sweeping criticism the following passage is of the proof-text method—of bringing a doctrine

from elsewhere to Scripture merely for confirmation—in any Bible user's hands.

> Many in the church are affected by the Word of the Lord and devote themselves to the reading of it, and yet only a few have for their object the desire to be instructed in truth. For the most part they remain in their own particular dogmas, *which alone they endeavor to establish from the Word.* These readers seem to be in some affection for the truth, but are not; only those are who love to be instructed in truths and to know what is true, and *who search the Scriptures to this end.* (Arcana Coelestia, n. 4368.)

In the words which we have italicized, notice the allusion in the first to the proof-text method, in the others to the employment of the Word in general as the source of doctrine. The passages we have quoted also specify the ruinous shortcoming of the proof-text method; under it practically any doctrinal view can be substantiated from Scripture, even a plurality of Gods (Canons, Trinity, viii. 3) or a tritheistic Trinity.

> Every heretic can and does confirm his heresy from the Word. (Canons, Trinity, viii. 1.)

It is hardly to be supposed that Swedenborg pursued or fell into a method which he criticized so severely and discerningly. On the contrary, it may better be presumed that he followed the method of Scripture for doctrine which he frequently summarizes and commends. He states as a principle that doctrine is to be drawn from the sense of the letter of the Word and confirmed thereby. Here, as we have said, are two distinct steps—a drawing of doctrine, and a confirming of it. Omit the first process, and we have only the proof-text method left. Too little stress has been laid on that first step. Nor does one take that first step by lifting a passage out of Scripture, like a single saying on divorce, and making it his doctrine. The process is not so simple. The Latin word translated "draw" even more than our English word points to a process of elaboration. Swedenborg speaks of the truths of doctrine as arising by "explication" from the Word (Arcana Coelestia, n. 9025(2e)). He speaks of "gathering" doctrine from the Word (De Verbo, n. 48). Any of these words points to

an assembling of the Scriptures which deal with the subject on which doctrine is wanted and to an active derivation of the doctrine from the assembled material. We shall study this process in detail in a third paper. Our present point is that this method of drawing doctrine first of all from the Word—a method he not only describes but prescribes (Sacred Scripture, chap. v.)—Swedenborg himself must have pursued. The principle he states for use of Scripture in theology, he must himself have heeded. Though he does not say that the method is his own, we cannot be wrong in considering that it is.

The evidence for the fact that Swedenborg followed the modern theological method with Scripture is to be found in his doctrinal works on a close examination and test. Finally, the evidence must be found there, of course. One can take a Scripture passage with which there is no indication that Swedenborg worked, and which he does not cite. It will assume its place or find reflection in the doctrine which he professes to have drawn from the Word. Each of the chief doctrinal works was done at the conclusion of a protracted occupation with Scripture: "New Jerusalem and its Heavenly Doctrine" at the end of many years of work on Scripture in connection with the "Arcana"; "Four Leading Doctrines" after further work in Scripture for the "Apocalypse Explained"; "True Christian Religion," after another period of occupation with Scripture in connection with the "Apocalypse Revealed." Large assemblages of Scripture were made mentally or in notebooks, though they may not have been reproduced in the course of a published doctrinal book. One such written collection was finally published in an English translation under the title, "Scripture Confirmations." The title, we think, is unfortunate. It is hard to escape the feeling that the book was so entitled because the confirming of doctrine from Scripture seemed to be the whole process with Scripture, owing, I think it must be confessed, to the retention among us of the proof-text habit of mind. The title given the book by its first Latin editor bespeaks this habit of mind even more plainly:

"Dicta Probantia"—what is this but "proof-texts"? These assembled passages are sources on which Swedenborg means to draw, apparently for the formulation of his teaching in "Coronis." He assembles passages from the earliest Christian sources, *Acts* and the *Epistles,* as well as from the *Gospels, Revelation* and portions of the Old Testament. There is already arrangement under doctrinal heads and here and there comment on spiritual meaning. Only a portion of the material is utilized in the unfinished "Coronis." As a rule, indeed, Swedenborg cites relatively few passages of Scripture in confirmation of a teaching; for in their real import they are samples from the body of Scripture passages which he has amassed. Otherwise, it should be remembered, too, the few passages which he does cite are often insufficient basis for his teaching; they are, however, excellent reminders of the ampler body of such passages which afford the adequate basis.

I have been calling the wider and more thorough procedure with Scripture the modern theological method. I am speaking of its use in systematic theology. In biblical theological, so-called, we are offered a theology of the *Psalms,* a theology of *Isaiah,* a theology of the Gospels, indeed a theology of *Mark* different from the theology of *John,* etc., and are told that there is no one theology of the Old Testament nor of the New. It all sounds as though the recourse to the Bible for doctrine had become a recourse to separate books, not to a unifiable Scripture. But these theologies are historical studies. They are studies in what the books originally and separately taught. It is a different story when we turn to the field of systematic theology and its dealing with Scripture. Then the theologian does not study the Bible only for the historical message of the separate books (his work must be grounded, of course, in such biblical studies); he seeks what the Scriptures offer for a doctrine which will be guidance to the spiritual life now. This objective unifies the Scriptures for him. Dr. Clarke, whose book on the current theological method of Scripture we mentioned above, himself employed

the method in a much valued "Outline of Christian Theology." It is such pursuit of the method in the field of systematic theology that I have had in mind. Even then, of course, one book or one portion of Scripture offers more than another on a subject, as *John*, for example, is uniquely valuable for doctrine about the Holy Spirit; again, some parts of Scripture, like stretches of ancient legislation, genealogies, bare historical narratives, are in themselves devoid of doctrinal content or implication; and so on. But with all the discriminations which he makes in his material, and in fact through making them, the theologian beholds in Scripture a unity of thought and truth which makes it possible to employ the Scriptures comprehensively as a source of doctrine. Making similar discriminations in material, as we shall see, Swedenborg employed the Scriptures similarly as his source, in the inspired effort to formulate their teaching for the promotion of the spiritual life anew.

I have tried to show in this first paper that Swedenborg utilized a method with Scripture which long after his day became the approved method of the theologian. He visited plain and trenchant criticisms on the now abandoned proof-text method. Rejection of the latter, prevalent in his day, was obviously conscious, but pursuit of the truer way was so native to Swedenborg that the reader of his doctrinal works is not made conscious of it. Swedenborg's procedure, we can be sure, included more than this method, but it did include it as a fundamental process—everywhere he insists on the derivation of the substance of doctrine from the sense of the letter of the Word. We shall proceed in a second paper to consider the broad foundations in Scripture making it possible to use the Bible comprehensively for doctrine. In a third article we expect to describe in some detail Swedenborg's procedure in drawing doctrine from Scripture; in a fourth will discuss some aids with which Swedenborg surrounded his employment of the method; and in a closing paper consider our own use of the method in sermon, book or formulation of private views.

William F. Wunsch.

SWEDENBORG AND MASONRY*

By the late Edwin S. Crandon

ONE of those persistent errors which cloud the pages of history is that the great Swedish scientist, Swedenborg [1688-1772], was identified with the Masonic Order. He was not a Mason, yet books have been written which claim that he was; one, at least, by a Mason and a member of the body of Christians organized after his death by some of those who accepted Swedenborg's theological teachings or revelations. Swedenborg never organized a sect; he died as he had lived, a Lutheran, or member of the Swedish Church. The Church of the New Jerusalem, or New Church, mistakenly called "Swedenborgian," came into being after his death. There are many receivers or partial receivers of the doctrines which he revealed who are not identified with the organized church to which common usage has given his name. His revelations, to a notable extent, have modified the Christian thought of the world, have influenced the whole history of religion since his remarkable publications, beginning in 1745, wherein he turned suddenly from one of the foremost scientists of the world into one of the greatest of its theologians.

It was nearly twenty years ago that the writer sought to study the origin of the persistent linking of Swedenborg and Masonry. He satisfied himself thoroughly then that Swedenborg had no connection whatever with our Order. He sees no reason to change the view today. And the appeal is to two authorities: to the "Documents Concerning Swedenborg," edited with rare ability, zeal and affection by Dr.

*The article here reprinted from *The New England Craftsman*, Vol. III, No. 6, was written by a New-Churchman who was also a thirty-second degree Mason. The matter has not previously been brought to the attention of the New-Church organization; and the editors hope it will be effective in correcting erroneous opinions still held by some New-Churchmen.—Editors.

Rudolph Tafel; and to the painstaking, analytical, judicial Mackey. Moreover, certain extraneous evidence of a convincing nature, brought to his attention, has swept away every vestige of the theory, though it has been maintained in book form by at least one author, both Mason and clergyman of the (so-called) Swedenborgian Church.

Much of the argument for the membership of Swedenborg in the Masonic Order rests on this, that the teachings of the great Swedish seer are what the world calls "mystical," using natural objects to express or to represent spiritual or internal ideas—the Science of Correspondences, Swedenborg calls it, by which everything of the material world corresponds to something of the internal, or spiritual realm. Now, Masonry uses symbols to convey its lessons; the representations of higher, internal affections and ideas are seen in the various phases of the Temple building; the uses of the significations of the materials of the Temple, of key stones, the working tools, the decorations, the methods of work, the many emblems, are too familiar to need more than reference. Swedenborg reduced symbolism to an exact science, or revealed, rather, the exact science under which everything of matter is shown to have its correspondence with internal things. The imagery of the Scriptures at once will suggest the basis for this doctrine; the Bible is full of it, from Genesis to Revelation. "Without a parable spake He not unto them"; "the letter killeth, the spirit maketh alive."

Masonry teaches much of its lesson through this imagery, this representation by natural objects of eternal verities. It was natural that the Order and the Seer should be linked together in the enthusiastic fancy of students of the one or the other, or of both. It was a Mason and a clergyman of the New-Jerusalem Church who gave rein to his fancy and published a book setting forth that Swedenborg was a Mason. A New-Church Doctor of Divinity,* not a Mason, and a great Masonic student and cyclopaedist, not a New-Churchman, patiently and at great expenditure of time and earnest

*Dr. Tafel was a PH.D., not a D.D.

devotion in research, as a result of their separate studies, the one in Europe, the other in America, came to the like conclusion: Swedenborg was not a Mason.

But many of those who accept his theological teachings are Masons, and among the many Rites of Masonry, practiced in the past, is certainly a "Rite of Swedenborg." What are the facts? In the belief that the subject may be of interest to some in these days of eager study, when Masons more and more are realizing the historic and the literary grandeur of our beloved Order, the writer here sets forth as briefly as may be commensurate with the necessary demands of the subject the results of his consultation of the leading authorities of the two interests most prominent in the inquiry, the Church to which the world, though not its members, gives the name of Swedenborg, and the grand old, yet ever young, Masonic Order itself.

Denying Swedenborg's connection with Masonry are Mackey, our standard Masonic cyclopaedist, and Dr. Rudolph Tafel, the compiler of the invaluable collection of "Documents Concerning Swedenborg," the recognized authority because the source-authority in the New-Jerusalem Church respecting the life of the great Scientist, Philosopher and Theologian. Affirming it most directly is Samuel Beswick, an American writer, who in 1870 published a book, "The Swedenborg Rite and the Great Masonic Leaders of the Eighteenth Century." Others who take the affirmative are various Masonic writers, mostly European, all of whom, I am satisfied, wrote on others' say-so, without adequate research or investigation, accepting and passing on an error that reaches its apotheosis in Beswick's remarkable book. It is but fair to say that the writer of this paper has reasons for discrediting the last named book as purely fanciful, even imaginative; and numerous clergymen and laymen of prominence in the New-Jerusalem (or Swedenborgian) Church have given him ample foundation for his opinion. But the book was published, and as it was considered gravely by Mackey, also by Dr. Tafel, it is well to give its claims,

though the greatest brevity is all that it requires; and the refutation of Mackey, supported by the result of a study in the "Documents" as compiled by Dr. Tafel, I think will demonstrate the matter conclusively.

According to Beswick's book, Swedenborg was initiated in a lodge in the town of Lund, in Sweden, in 1706, and visited many lodges in Sweden and other countries, besides taking an active interest in Masonic work. A number of writers among the French Masons—perhaps the most enthusiastic and prolific of authors, as well as producers of "rites"—take Swedenborg's membership in the Order for granted, as above observed; but Masonry was not introduced into Sweden until 1736, and in 1738 it was placed under an interdict, with the penalty of death, which lasted seven years. To quote from Rebold:

> In Sweden the endeavor was, as it also was in Germany, to discover the truth in relation to the system of the Templars, of which the chiefs had been expelled from the latter country. These researches wrought in the system some modifications, which were due in great part to one of the most eminent Masons of the time —the brother Swedenborg—intimate councillor of the king, who had introduced religious principles, impressed with his own mystical creed, and which in consequence has imprinted upon Swedish Masonry a particular character, which distinguishes it to the present day. Beside the Templar system thus transformed, Zinnendorf, surgeon in chief of the Swedish army at Berlin and Grand Pryor of the system of the Templars, having abandoned the chiefs of the rite after he had exposed their juggleries, established in Sweden a rite of seven degrees which bears his name, founded in part on the same religious principles, but less mystical than those of Swedenborg. It is this rite that now is found to predominate and is known in Europe as the Swedish rite, or rite of Zinnendorf.

Here we have direct assertion by a French writer, but no evidence, not a citation of proof. All of Rebold's references to the subject are contained in the question; Beswick simply asserts, without a reference. The learned Mackey, of recognized authority in the Craft, appears carefully to have studied all of the evidence from Masonic literature, and says:

> The eagerness is indeed extraordinary with which all Masonic

writers, German, French, English and American, have sought to connect the name and labors of the Swedish sage with the Masonic institution, and that, too, without the slightest foundation for such a theory, either in his writings or in any credible memorials of his life.

In brief, the position rests on this, that Swedenborg's theological system is based on the correspondence of things natural with things spiritual—that is, natural objects typify, represent or correspond to spiritual things, and the world has called this "mysticism." The student of Swedenborg finds his system wondrously coherent; no one ever found a flaw in it in any of his works; if a natural object is explained as representing or corresponding to a spiritual idea in his earliest works, it is given the same explanation in his latest, and on this remarkable plan he elucidates the inner or spiritual sense of the Sacred Scriptures. Thus many of the "hard sayings" of the Bible become luminous; their real meaning is within the letter. Now Masonry has taken the symbols of architecture to represent eternal verities and draws many of its grandest lessons from these significations. With Swedenborg this was no accident or coincidence—it was eternal law; the Word of God was written according to this system or, as he calls it, Science of Correspondences. That our Masonic students of the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries should have reasoned that such apparent identity of "mystical" explanations of symbolism, pointed to Swedenborg as a Mason, is not strange. But the student of today, both of Swedenborg and Masonry, can discern that both were working out the same truth along absolutely independent lines. Both make sharp departures from the cold literalism which even now holds so many in its thrall. Both aided in emancipating men from materialism, both sought higher and eternal verities behind the letter of God's revelations.

Quotations from Swedenborg's theological writings can be made at length which at first glance are striking in their apparent Masonic indications. His explanations of the Book of Revelations, his references to the "Word"—many

and many of them—his revelations of the signification of the "white stone," of the "new name," of many Scripture texts with which our Order is familiar; moreover, his references to a "lost Word,"—more properly, lost books of the Sacred Scripture, for Swedenborg always refers to the Bible as the "Word of the Lord" and in his works the name "Lord" always is given as [synonymous with] "Jehovah," in itself a significant fact—here go far, with numerous similar citations, to justify at first consideration the conclusion that he must have been a Mason. But to Mackey and to Masons who also are receivers of the doctrines revealed by Swedenborg, they do no more than to prove that Eternal Truth may have more than one method of revelation, and that perfectly independent research may result in a similar conclusion. Masonry resembles Swedenborg's teachings because both are true, though it by no means follows that the two are identical or that one had anything to do with the genesis or working out of the other. Says Mackey, after quoting significant paragraphs from the great Swede:

> Such passages as these might lead one to suppose that Swedenborg was familiar with the system of Masonic ritualism. His complete reticence upon the subject, however, and the whole tenor of his life, his studies and his habits, assure us that such was not the case, and that if there were really a borrowing of one from the other, and not an accidental coincidence, it was the Freemasons of the high degrees who borrowed from Swedenborg, and not Swedenborg from them. And if so, we cannot deny that he has, unwittingly, exercised a powerful influence on Masonry.

And that is my conclusion, that the eager and enthusiastic students of Masonry in the so-called higher degrees, particularly on the European continent, and especially in France, were quick to see in the revelations of the Swedish seer—at first an eminent scientist, engineer and statesman, later a theologian who never founded a sect, who never sold one of his books, who wrote in Latin and freely gave away his publications, whose greatest claim was "Servant of the Lord Jesus Christ"—the vindication of their claims for the reason for existence of many of these degrees, speculative,

mystical, hermetic, Rosicrucian, Apocalyptic and the rest. They boldly claimed him as a Mason on the strength of what they called the Masonic character of his writings. But this is an inversion of the facts; the higher degrees, insofar as they found support in Swedenborg, or were influenced by free drafts upon his revelations, were "Swedenborg-ized." Their theory was incorrect; without an iota of proof, they reasoned that because they could find certain warrant in his writings for their own mystical speculations, he must have been a Mason. Not so; they seized proof where they could find it, and were pleased enough to sustain and to justify their grafting on the Masonic tree of the whole weird fabric of mysticism and late mediaeval research into the unknown realm of spiritual influence on the material plane of our existence.

Examples of this theory are shown in such authors as Findel, thus:

> Most likely [note the pure assumption] Swedenborg, the mystic and visionary, used his influence in bringing about the new system; at all events, he smoothed the way for it.

Reghellini's work on French Masonry says:

> Swedenborg made very many learned researches on the subject of the Masonic mysteries. He thought that their doctrines were of the highest antiquity, having emanated from the Egyptians, the Persians, the Magi, the Jews and the Greeks. He also became the head of a new religion in his effort to reform that of Rome.* For this purpose he wrote his "Celestial Jerusalem, or Spiritual World."† He mingled with his reform, ideas which were purely Masonic [sic]. In his "Celestial Jerusalem," the Word, formerly communicated by God to Moses is found; this Word . . . lost on earth, he invites us to find in Great Tartary, a country still gov-

*Swedenborg did not try specially to reform Roman Catholicism any more than Protestantism; he grouped them both as "The First Christian Church," and he found in the doctrine of salvation by faith alone of the Reformed Churches an even greater falsity than in most of the Roman Catholic teachings; moreover, no organization of the receivers of his doctrines was formed until after his death.—E. S. C.

†No such title occurs among the writings of Swedenborg; probably the "Arcana Cœlestia" is meant.—E. S. C.

erned, even in our days, by the patriarchs, by which he means allegorically to say that this people most nearly approach to the primitive condition of the perfection of innocence.

This is an odd jumble of Swedenborg's teachings. Reghellini attributes to Swedenborg the making of the Hebrew name of Deity, which he italicizes, the Word which was committed by God to Moses, showing an utter lack of comprehension of Swedenborg's teachings, and I write as a student of these teachings for over a quarter century. The "Word" referred to by Swedenborg throughout his theological writings is the Word of God, or Holy Scriptures—those books of the Bible that contain an internal, or spiritual sense, not a collection of letters going to make up the great and unspeakable Name of Deity. Reghellini clearly read Swedenborg most superficially and shows it plainly in confounding Swedenborg's constant references to the "Word" as identical with Masonic use of a "Word." Swedenborg's name for the whole body of written Divine Revelation, the Sacred Scriptures, the Bible, is "The Word." Masonic use of the term, it scarcely need be said, is entirely different. Swedenborg certainly teaches that certain books of the ancient Scriptures were lost and that they are kept in Tartary. In our English version of the Scriptures there are references to these lost books of the Scriptures—"Jasher," for example, in Joshua x, 12, 13, "The Wars of Jehovah" and "The Enunciations,"—Numbers xxi, 14-15, 27-30.

According to Swedenborg, these three books were part of an Ancient Scripture, or Word, preceding the present, or Mosaic and Christian canons of Scripture, with which, however, Moses and other early writers of the Israelitish dispensation were familiar, and it is to this Ancient Word, or Scriptures, that he refers, as being "lost" and yet preserved in Tartary. His use of the term "Word" to mean the whole body of Divine Revelation in the Scriptures or Bible, is what has confused the able French Masonic writer, though no Mason can fail to note the coincidence, at least,

of the loss of such a "Word" with his own knowledge of the use of the term in the system of our Order. That eager Masonic students should seize on this coincidence and deduce from it that Swedenborg was a Mason, is not strange; that, on the contrary, they were a borrowing, the European Freemasons of the so-called higher degrees borrowing from Swedenborg, by reason of a coincidence in expression which they did not analyze or understand how to analyze, is the conclusion of Mackey, as well as of those receivers of the doctrines of Swedenborg who are members of the Masonic Order and who have devoted much study to both.

That is, Masonic writers, until Mackey exposed the fallacy, reasoned that Swedenborg's revelations that the Scriptures [the "Word" of God] are written by correspondences —the natural object or person signifying spiritual verities— proved him to be a Mason. As a matter of fact, these students of Masonic symbolism found so much in Swedenborg to support their theories that they claimed him as *per se* a Mason, a reasoning backward. The other side of it is pointed out by Mackey, that utterly without Swedenborg's knowledge or interest, he exercised a powerful influence on Masonry by the use made of his Writings by students of the so-called higher degrees in the various rites and systems of Europe.

Rebold, already quoted, in a list of forty-four rites called Masonic which have become absorbed into some existing rite, or have become extinct, has this:

> Rite of the Illuminati of Avignon, being the system of Swedenborg in 1779.

The date here refers to the year in which the rite was first practiced. A list of the various Masonic rites extant, fourteen in all, has this as the third in order:

> Rite practiced by the Grand Lodge of Stockholm, commonly called the Swedish rite, or system of Swedenborg, comprising eight degrees and arranged in 1773.

And in a chronological history of European Masonry, Rebold says:

A. D. 1760—At Avignon, the mother lodge of the rite of Swedenborg is instituted by the Benedictine monk, Dom Pernetti, and a Pole named Grabianca. The philosopher, Swedenborg, one of the most learned and illustrious Freemasons of his time, in instituting this rite had in view a desire to reform the Roman Catholic religion. The dogmas of the reform of Swedenborg are adopted by a good many influential persons in Sweden, England and Germany, where societies which practice his religious system have been formed by these persons.

And again:

A. D. 1770—At Avignon is organized the Grand Scottish Lodge of the county Venaissin, which adopts the Hermetic rite of Swedenborg.

As to this lodge at Avignon, Mackey says:

The important basis on which the theory of a Swedenborgian Masonry has been built is the conduct of some of his own disciples, who imbued with his religious views, being Masons, carried the spirit of the New-Jerusalem doctrines into their Masonic speculations. There was, it is true, a Masonic rite, or system of Swedenborg, but its true history is this:

The . . . important basis on which the theory of a Swedenborgian "Celestial Arcana" and "The New-Jerusalem," appeared, the former between the years of 1749 and 1753, and the latter in 1758. About that period we find Pernetty working out his schemes of Masonic reform. Pernetty was a theosophist, a Hermetic philosopher, a disciple to some extent of Jacob Bohme, the prince of mystics. To such a man, the reveries, the visions and the spiritual speculations of Swedenborg were peculiarly attractive. He accepted them as an addition to the theosophic views which he already had received. About the year 1760 he established at Avignon his Rite of the Illuminati, in which the reveries of both Bohme and Swedenborg were introduced. In 1783 this system was reformed by the Marquis de Thome, another Swedenborgian, and out of that reform arose what was called "The Rite of Swedenborg," not because Swedenborg had established it, or had anything directly to do with its establishment, but because it was based on his peculiar theological views, and because its symbolism was borrowed from the ideas he had advanced in the highly symbolical works that he had written.

A portion of these degrees, or other degrees much like them, have been called Apocalyptic, not because St. John had, any more than Swedenborg, a connection with them, but because their system of initiation is based on the mystical teachings of the Apocalypse

[the Book of Revelation] a work which, not less than the theories of the Swede, furnishes abundant food for a system of Masonico-religious symbolism. Benedict Chastanier, also another disciple of Swedenborg, and who was one of the founders of the Avignon society, carried these views into England, and founded at London a similar rite, which afterwards was changed into a purely religious association under the name of the Theosophical Society,* instituted for the purpose of promoting the Heavenly Doctrines of the New-Jerusalem.

The organization of the Church of the New Jerusalem (commonly called Swedenborgian) followed that of the Theosophical Society, and the word "Theosophical" now applies to an entirely different system of religious thought and endeavor, since the advent of M. Blavatsky, Col. Olcott and their successors. The New-Jerusalem Church in this country, and it numbers more members than in any other, is one of the smallest of the Christian denominations; its influence has been potent, however, in aiding to moderate the former asperities of theological discussion; it conducts a quiet but efficient work in publication and in aiding its members to live the life of religion, which is to do good.

To return to the Avignon society, I am inclined to the view that it was not truly Masonic, and it certainly was not a New-Church (or Swedenborgian) institution. Hindmarsh in his book, "The Rise and Progress of the New-Jerusalem Church," tells of a visit which was made to the early receivers of the doctrines of Swedenborg in London by the Count Grabianca, who has been referred to in this account of the Avignon society, from which he came, and made friends with the little circle of believers, showed the resemblances of their views, but talked mysteriously of a "grand secret" which could not be revealed until a later time. After much waiting and mysterious allusions the

*The statement here seems to involve an error. "The Theosophical Society" for translating and publishing Swedenborg's Writings, was apparently instituted quite independently of Chastanier, who, however, early became a member of it. He was an earnest Mason, and endeavored vigorously to interest other Masons in Swedenborg's Writings.

grand secret turned out to be the idea of four persons in the Godhead, the fourth being the blessed Virgin Mary. Naturally, continues Hindmarsh, such blasphemy was received with emphatic horror and rebrobation by the brethren, and the Count went back to Avignon. Later, some of the London brethren made a journey to Avignon, where they witnessed various blasphemies carried on and other eccentric vagaries, which caused the return of the English receivers of the doctrines, imbued with disgust.

These views and practices are radically opposite, both from Swedenborg's teachings and those of Masonry, also from the consistent practice of the adherents of both. The writer is convinced that the society at Avignon had no more to do with Swedenborg's teachings than with Masonry; it simply helped itself from both as much or as little as suited its purposes. It should be said, however, that Chastanier, referred to above, first issued an appeal to the Freemasons to avail themselves of the riches of philosophy in Swedenborg's works and thus be the means of spreading the same, but afterwards abandoned the idea of making the Masonic order the agent of their dissemination, and became a full and hearty receiver of the doctrines of the New-Jerusalem Church, going to London and performing much good for the cause.

Having given this much of evidence from the New-Church (or Swedenborgian) historian, following that of our able Masonic cyclopaedist, Mackey, in refutation of the too quickly formed opinions of the school of continental writers, we come now to the concluding testimony. Dr. Rudolph Tafel, a learned German receiver of Swedenborg's doctrines, devoted much of his life work to gathering, editing and publishing "Documents Concerning Swedenborg," in effect compiling the sources of his biography. He gives considerable attention to the persistent allegation of Swedenborg's connection with Masonry, saying:

> All this speculation about Swedenborg's having joined the Order of Freemasonry in Lund, in 1706, is exploded by the following

historical account of the establishment of Freemasonry in Sweden, taken from Ersch and Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyklopadie,* vol. xlix, p. 69, from which it appears that Freemasonry was not introduced into Sweden until 1736. We read there: "Freemasonry, which was introduced from England in 1736, and quickly took root in Sweden, was forbidden by Frederick I. on October 21, 1738, under penalty of death, but seven years later the prohibition was rescinded and the institution was placed on a secure basis. The king placed himself at its head and received the homage of the delegates of the lodge. . . . Since 1786, Freemasonry in Sweden inclined partly to the metaphysical and mystico-theosophical efforts of Swedenborg, whence arose the Swedish system, which has nine* degrees and which was soon favorably received in England and Russia. In a modified form of seven degrees, which was introduced by Zinnendorf, it exists also in the Grand Lodge of Germany, in Berlin."

This account was written by one of the historians of Freemasonry, August Wilb. Muller, the editor of the Masonic journal, *Astraea.* Dr. Tafel continues:

As the order of Freemasonry was not introduced into Sweden before 1736 and as it was not placed on a safe footing there until 1745, the assertion of Beswick's book, that Swedenborg was "a constant visitor in the chapters" of Sweden between 1706 and 1740, falls to the ground.

Swedenborg was prominent in Government offices of the highest rank, and certainly was noted as a patriotic Swede and earnest supporter of the Government under which he held high office. There were no Masonic chapters in Sweden before 1740, certainly none in the towns mentioned

*NOTE—It may be interesting to have the names of the degrees composing the so-called Rite of Swedenborg. Mackey gives the names of six, saying that Reghellini, who says it consists of eight, evidently has confounded it with the rite of Martinism, also a Theosophic rite and the ritualism of which also partakes of a Swedenborgian character. The six degrees of the Rite of Swedenborg are: (1) Apprentice, (2) Fellowcraft, (3) Masks Neophyte, (4) Illuminated Theosophite, (5) Blue Brother, (6) Red Brother. It is said to be still practiced by some of the Swedish lodges, but elsewhere is extinct. It also may be interesting to know that the sixth degree of the Swedish rite, as now practiced in Sweden called "Knights of the East," is Apocalyptic, the New-Jerusalem and its twelve gates being represented.

—Lund, Stockholm, Greifswalde, Straslund and Christianstad. And the same refutation is made by Dr. Tafel of the further assertions of Swedenborg's visiting Masonic lodges in other countries, notably in Paris. Among the great Swede's private papers and manuscripts there is not a single iota about Freemasonry in any way. Swedenborg was in Paris from September 3, 1736, to March 12, 1738, and he kept a minute account, or diary, of his doings in the journal of his travels. He mentions several Swedish gentlemen on whom he called, in addition to his bankers, but nowhere speaks of any Masonic acquaintances.

It may be added that in these years, and up to 1742, Swedenborg was the man of science, of political interests, a legislator, counsellor, interested in public affairs; not a hint had come of the great change in his life which took place in 1742, after which he devoted himself entirely to his theological works. Born in Stockholm, January 29, 1688, he died March 29, 1772. The last thirty years of his life were the period of his theological writing; before that he was eminently the scientist. He was a member of the upper house of the Swedish parliament, Assessor of Mines, was ennobled by Charles XII,* a great student of mathematics, astronomy and mechanics, and his scientific works aggregate seventy-seven, about one-half of them published, though the substance of the others was incorporated in the larger works published. He not only wrote on the natural sciences, but applied them directly to the good of his country, in the fields of mineralogy, engineering and mechanics generally.

As the whole basis for connecting him with the Masonic order is the fancied resemblance of some of his theological writings to Masonic teachings, the theories which we have quoted, that he must have been a member of the Order, lost their force. But for yet more direct disproof, we learn from Dr. Tafel that the whole subject is treated by Dr. A. Kohl, Dean of Lund, in a work entitled "The New-Church and Its Influence on the Study of Theology in

*An error; he was ennobled by Queen Ulrica.

Sweden" (Part IV, pp. 63-88), where he concludes:

> The agreement between the dogmas of Freemasonry and the New Jerusalem has, no doubt, led Reghellini di Schio to the idea that Swedenborg was one of the most celebrated reformers among the Masons and had himself founded a lodge of nine degrees. This assertion, however, lacks historical basis, as far as it has been possible to trace up this matter. Swedenborg did not found, but some of his friends and disciples, e.g., Chastanier and Pernetty, have founded Masonic lodges. And one result attained by their efforts is that within the ranks of Freemasonry they have directed the ideas of men to the doctrines of the New Jerusalem, so that these doctrines have really exerted an influence upon the progress and development of the Order in Sweden as well as in other countries.

And that is the conclusion, already quoted, of Mackey. Thus we have New-Church and Masonic authority of the highest, distinctly disproving a mistaken, fanciful, imaginative claim, the persistence of which is one of the remarkable phases of our whole Masonic history, but which is not difficult to understand by the reader interested enough to read the summary which has been given above, imperfect and necessarily brief, yet perhaps of interest to some of the increasingly large number of Masons who delight in studying its wondrously rich and varied historical literature. That Masons were quick to appreciate the grandeur of the great Swede's revelations, to apply, if but a little, his wondrous relations of things heard and seen in the spiritual world to the strengthening of their own symbolism, to draw so freely from him, is a tribute indeed; that he was not a member of the Order is of little importance; that he aided so materially in enriching Masonry is of greatest interest. And our own Mackey's conclusion shall be my own:

> If there were really a borrowing of one from the other, . . . it was the Freemasons of the high degrees who borrowed from Swedenborg and not Swedenborg from them. And so, we cannot deny that he has, unwittingly, exercised a powerful influence on Masonry.

EDWIN S. CRANDON.

"THE NEW CHURCH IN THE NEW WORLD"*

By the Rev. Lewis Field Hite

THERE has been in recent years a vague but widespread and growing anticipation that we are nearing the breaking of a new day of religious light, and the outpouring of a new spirit into the life of the Christian world and into all the religions of mankind. This longing expectation is begotten of dissatisfaction with the present conditions of Christian civilization, and especially with *religious* conditions throughout the world. We are just now in the midst of an unparalleled period of depression,—economic, intellectual, and moral. At such times people are disposed to lose some of their self-confidence and some of their feeling of independence, and to turn to religion with a quickened sense of their need of God. The expectation of a new day of enlightenment and power, a fuller manifestation of Christ's spirit, is enlivened and strengthened by the extraordinary awakening of humanitarian impulse and interest. The life of love for men is becoming a recognized object of achievement, and is being deliberately embodied in organized agencies; such for example as the Salvation Army, the Peace Treaties, the League of Nations, and many others of perhaps less importance and influence. Then, too, while the long standing traditional doctrines of Christianity have been almost completely abandoned, the Christian spirit is still appealed to. It is the refreshing power of the Christian spirit that prompts the expectation of its fuller realization. This is often expressed as the expectation of Christ's promised and fuller Second Coming.

**The New Church in the New World:* A Study of Swedenborgianism in America. By Marguerite Beck Block. New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1932. 386 pp., 8vo. Cloth, $3.75.

The evidences of this Second Coming, however, point to a very different set of conditions. The New Church, signified by the New Jerusalem in the Book of Revelation, proclaims the Second Coming as an accomplished fact; but the world as yet pays little heed to its message.

Under these circumstances, the title "The New Church in the New World" is attractive and suggestive. It appeals to the idea of a revived Christianity, and to the idea that the world is being made new. The New Church which this book describes is quite definitely the Church organization, with its doctrines, polity, and history, which goes under the name "New Church" among other Christian bodies; but because of Swedenborg's agency in its establishment, it is commonly called by outsiders "Swedenborgianism."

Mrs. Block's work is a notable achievement from the point of view of professional and historical treatment. It is a thesis selected and prepared under the guidance of the philosophical department of Columbia University; and this fact makes her work all the more interesting and important It is evidence of the growing interest of professional circles in Swedenborg's writings and influence.

Mrs. Block approaches her task with serious purpose and with approved historical methods. She is studiously careful to maintain the attitude and spirit of historical objectivity, and her judgments are for the most part moderate and detached. It appears that in the course of her reading and studies she acquired a sympathetic interest in some of the distinctive features of the Church, and an appreciation of their worth. In these cases, she expresses her interest and appreciation freely.

The book itself is attractive in appearance, printed in good type, and well indexed. There is appended a valuable collection of notes, giving volume and page references to passages and documents which are the sources of the authority for statements in the text. There is also a helpful and capacious bibliography. The book is well written, interesting, and instructive. The style is simple and direct, with

constant attention to plain narrative. As shown by the notes of reference and the bibliography, the writing was preceded by industrious preparation. The important statements are supported by page reference to the original documents. The 386 pages are divided into thirteen chapters, preceded by a brief Preface and with a Postlude summing up conclusions.

The first five chapters are headed respectively, I. Emanuel Swedenborg: His Life and Mission; II. "The Heavenly Doctrines": An Outline of New Church Theology; III. Reception of the Doctrines: The Birth of the New Church; IV. The New Church in America: The Pioneers; and V. Beyond the Alleghenies: The New Church on the Frontier. These chapters give a good account of Swedenborg's life and work, a good summary of New-Church doctrine, and the story in brief of the rise and progress of the organized body of the Church.

The account of Swedenborg is for the most part a matter of fact narrative, but occasionally the author seems to have been misled by the comments of her authorities. In these cases there should be a more careful reading of the original documents so as to sift fact from interpretation. It would be out of place here to consider these in detail.

The chapter on "The Heavenly Doctrines" is well done. First of all the summary taken from "A Brief Exposition" is given. Then good statements of the Doctrines follow in order, preceded by an account of Swedenborg's marvelous preparation and his thoroughgoing preliminary labors. The recital of what he says about the character of the Word and about the nature of the revelation of which he was the bearer, very properly leads to a description of the "Arcana Cœlestia" with its interpretation of Genesis and Exodus, including the "succession of the Churches" and the doctrine of correspondence. The Doctrines as to the Future Life, the Spiritual World, the Second Coming, and the New Church are all well summarized; so too the Doctrine of the Lord, Redemption, Regeneration, the Sacraments, the Doctrine of Life, and finally the Doctrine of Marriage. In all

this the author shows sympathy and good judgment. The language follows closely the statements of the Doctrines themselves, without being overloaded with comment or interpretation.

Chapters III, IV, V, headed respectively "Reception of the Doctrines: the Birth of the New Church," "The New Church in America: the Pioneers," and "Beyond the Alleghenies: the New Church on the Frontier," gives a condensed account of the rise and progress of the Church. The early movements in Sweden, Germany, and France are sketched.

In Germany, Prelate Oetinger, Abbé Pernety, Court Librarian to Frederick III of Prussia, and Immanuel Tafel, were the leading promoters of interest in Swedenborg.

In France, the New-Church movement was inaugurated by a few men of high standing, among them Baron Breteuil, minister to Louis XV and a personal friend of Swedenborg at Stockholm as ambassador to Sweden, M. Moët, Librarian at Versailles who translated some of the Writings into French, Marquis de Thomé, Jean-Jacques Bernard, M. Oegger, First Vicar of the Cathedral of Paris and confessor to the Queen, Abbé François Ledru, a parish priest near Chartres, and, most important of all for the cause of the New Church, M. Le Boys des Guays of Sainte-Amand, publisher of *La Nouvelle Jerusalem*, a monthly magazine, an industrious translator and able writer, who in his ministry to the people of his community gathered a membership of one hundred and twenty.

Immanuel Kant gave notoriety to Swedenborg's name and fame in certain circles throughout Europe by showing an interest in the stories of his clairvoyance, and by the publication of *Träume eines Geistersehers erlautert durch Träume der Metaphysic*. We should say that Kant's treatment of Swedenborg, while no doubt discreditable, has been much misconceived and misrepresented. It is true that Kant inveighed against Swedenborg; but he went to the expense of buying the volumes of the "Arcana

Cœlestia," and took the time and trouble to read them. In spite of what has already been done, a fair and competent treatment of Kan't relation to Swedenborg is a much-to-be-desired piece of historical and philosophical investigation. The *Träume,* when read at all critically, gives abundant evidence that, for all his sarcasm, Kant was deeply perplexed by the metaphysical problems he encountered both in reading the "Arcana" and in his own thinking. To say that "He was thoroughly disgusted by the 'Arcana Cœlestia' " is quite misleading. The fact is, Kant was morbidly sensitive to public opinion, and especially to professional opinion; and he had a mortal dread of being associated with a strange personage such as Swedenborg appeared to be to some of the learned. He assumed an air of superiority which was by no means consistent with his avowed interest and his obligations. It seems that Kant was conspicuously affected with intellectual pride, and gloried in exhibiting his intellectual agility. This accounts in part at least for his extraordinary achievement in spinning formal abstractions. Some students of Kant and Swedenborg have recognized and commented on his dependence upon Swedenborg for his metaphysics of space and time, and of the sensible and supersensible worlds. It is a matter of record that Kant avowed his surprise and wonderment at Swedenborg's philosophical penetration.

The Church had its real beginning as an organized body of believers in England and America. Much has been made of Swedenborg's supposed indifference to a Church organization. It has been said and repeated that Swedenborg made no effort to found a Church. If this were taken merely to mean that he made no direct personal effort to collect and organize a body of followers, the statement would have some basis in fact. But the whole body of his religious teaching serves as the doctrinal basis for the establishment and development of the New Church, a body of believers holding these doctrines in common. Such a common belief would only be effective in a body organized for common

worship and for mutual promotion of the life inculcated by the doctrines. Swedenborg evidently anticipated the establishment and the perpetuation of an organized New-Church body, although he uses the word "Church" in various senses, sometimes of the individual, sometimes of a specific church body, sometimes in a universal sense as applied to all believers in the Lord who are faithful in life. The fact that Swedenborg did not collect and organize a body of personal followers has been exploited by the anti-separatists and the anti-ecclesiastics for their own purposes; but that fact simply means that he looked to the Lord and His truth as the founder of the Church. He was, however, perfectly well aware of his instrumentality and agency in founding the Church, and he did not hesitate on occasion to declare just what his agency was, namely, to receive and transmit the revelation needed.

The Church had its first beginning as an organization in the publication of the first volume of the "Arcana Cœlestia," by John Lewis, the printer. He advertised the book and its claims to the public. Stephen Penny, a prominent citizen of Dartmouth, saw the advertisement, got the book and read it. In a letter to John Lewis, he expressed his extraordinary satisfaction with the teachings of the book, and asked to be informed when the next volume would be published. Penny shared his interest with Thomas Cookworthy, a well-to-do chemist of Plymouth. Cookworthy, together with the Rev. Thomas Hartley of the established Church, visited Swedenborg at his quarters in London in 1769. In 1770, two years before Swedenborg's death, these two zealous propagandists co-operated in translating and publishing the "Treatise on Influx" and the "Doctrine of Life for the New Jerusalem." This was the first group associated in the work of propagating Swedenborg's writings. In 1773 an important accession was made to the forces working for the dissemination of the New-Church Doctrines. The Rev. John Clowes, Rector of St. John's Church, Manchester, became interested, and thereafter devoted the rest of his long

life to propagating the Doctrines by writing, preaching, and translating. In 1782 a Quaker friend lent a copy of "Heaven and Hell" to Robert Hindmarsh, a young man of nineteen, a printer by trade, and son of a Methodist Preacher, the Rev. James Hindmarsh. As in so many other cases in after years, the book made a profound impression and produced a revolutionary conviction. The young Hindmarsh was well fitted to lead a revolutionary movement. His first step was to form a reading circle, and to that end he advertised a public meeting of all the readers of Swedenborg in London for December 5th, 1783. The meetings thus begun continued regularly with growth in numbers and functions. The reading meetings quickly developed into an organization for propagating the Doctrines, under the name of "Theosophical Society." The next step was to provide for public worship and for other Church functions; and the Society presently formed itself into a Church body under the name of "The New Church, signified by the New Jerusalem in the Revelation." This was the first organized body of the Church of the New Jerusalem.

In the progress to this conclusion, it was inevitable that differences of opinion should arise as to the policy of forming a distinct Church body, or that of continuing to operate within the existing denominations. This was the beginning of the controversy between the "Separatists" and the "Non-Separatists." When the Rev. John Clowes heard of the proposal to form a New-Church body, he proceeded to London to dissuade the members from this policy. His argument was that the Doctrines would permeate the existing Churches, and would work the changes needed to make the Christian Church new. If it turned out otherwise, it would be time enough to institute a distinctive Church body. The appeal of Mr. Clowes, afterwards reinforced by a letter from the "Manchester friends," was answered in a statement drawn up and signed by seventy-seven members of the London Society. The controversy thus begun has persisted and disturbed the Church down to the present day, and has

all the while impeded the growth of the Church. It was natural that Mr. Clowes, a minister of the Established Church, should think that separation was uncalled for and unauthorized. Personal, official, and sentimental ties bound him to his Church. With others these considerations have weight; and in many cases worldly interests and motives would also influence decision. On the other hand, the Doctrine that the Lord has made His Second Coming in the spiritual sense of His Word commits believers to a new faith. The profession of this faith by a number of individuals establishes a spiritual bond, a spiritual communion, which has its fit expression in a body of believers organized to carry out the principles and obligations of the common belief. The idea that Swedenborg's Doctrines would permeate the teachings of the various religious bodies has been to a certain extent verified. Some of the Doctrines have been partially accepted; and many individuals have professed to have derived benefit from his writings; but comparatively few have adopted the New-Church Doctrines as a new revelation, as a distinct body of new Christian teaching, and have in consequence renounced their former faith and Church connections. Many of those who have done this have carried over with them their habitual modes of thinking and feeling about religious life and obligations. This makes separation all the more difficult. Then too the non-separatist views are supported by reluctance to sever habitual ties and Church connections, as well as by personal and worldly interests.

The story of this first little group of New-Church believers is interestingly told, with rather over-emphasis upon the differences and dissensions which were more or less inevitable in a miscellaneous group of this kind. Non-separatism, Mesmerism, Spiritism, Vegetarianism, anti-ecclesiasticism, were disturbing influences, in some cases resulting in secession movements. The first secession took place in Mr. Clowes' congregation of St. John's Church. A group headed by the Curate, the Rev. William Cowherd,

went off by themselves, and formed their own separate congregation, which, however, was afflicted with certain fads, and finally disappeared as a New-Church body. After Mr. Clowes' death, a part of his congregation separated and formed a New-Church society, while the rest relapsed into a purely Anglican communion, and so its New-Church character was completely effaced.

The story of the New Church in America is told in the characters and labors of such men as Robert Carter, James Glenn, William Hill, Francis Bailey, Dr. John Cabell, Arthur and William Campbell, John Hargrove, Thomas Worcester, Holland Weeks, William Schlatter, David Powell, Jonathan Chapman ("Johnny Appleseed"), Milo G. Williams, J. Young Scammon, George Field, Abiel Silver, J. R. Hibbard, J. P. Stuart, John Hough James, L. P. Mercer, Frank Sewall, John Worcester, and others. The two chapters, IV and V, on the New Church in America, give the story briefly, with enough detail to make the narrative interesting. It affords a good basis for a fuller history, and the documents cited would give the needed additional material.

Chapter VI, on the Intellectual Environment, is rather an account of various incursions of some New-Church people, or rather individuals, into outside movements of the day, such as Spiritism, Mesmerism, Fourierism, Transcendentalism, and others. These movements were disturbing rather than contributory to the constructive growth of the Church. Although they aroused some popular interest, they had little to do with forming the general intellectual environment of the time. New England Transcendentalism stimulated some intellectual and literary activity, but the characteristic intellectual environment of the period was political philosophy and religious controversy. Emerson did, of course, direct the attention of his circle of readers to Swedenborg. He had, however, little to do with forming the intellectual environment of the Church, which was for the most part doctrinal discussion.

Aside from the early chapters on Swedenborg and the Doctrines, the chapter which deals most directly with the growth of the Church is Chapter VII, on the General Convention. The account follows the story of the constructive development of the various phases of Church activity. The matter of ordination, the missionary and educational progress, publication, social life, liturgy, the Book of Worship, all these are described in a matter of fact way as features of Convention's constructive activities. There were of course inevitable differences of opinion. The heterogeneous membership of the Church, coming for the most part from dissentient bodies, naturally brought with it divergent traditions, habits, and prejudices, which asserted themselves on occasion with vehemence and determination. These various groups each interpreted the Doctrines from its own background, and thus disagreements arose, which were exaggerated by sectional differences. Philadelphia, which held the leading place in the early days, gradually yielded to Boston. The western members differed from the eastern in temper and habit. These differences sharpened when specific interpretations of doctrine and of specific subjects came up for consideration. In general there were the strict constructionists on the one hand, and the latitudinarians on the other. With the first, there was emphasis on distinctiveness, with the other a disposition to ignore and repel sharp distinctions, and fraternize with other religious bodies on equal terms. With either the principle of fraternal treatment was approved; with both the relation of equality was viewed cautiously and with qualifications.

The issues involved first centered, in Convention, on the question of re-baptism. Re-baptism was required on the ground that the New Church is a new dispensation of Christian truth, and is constituted by the Lord in His Second Coming in the spiritual sense of His Word. It is the common belief in this Second Coming that makes the New Church distinctive. On the other hand, it was argued that baptism into the Christian Church is sufficient

and inclusive. In this view the New Church, being Christian, is one of the members, denominations, of the Christian Church at large, and so in the rite of baptism no distinction is made. From this point of view re-baptism was an offense, a piece of presumptuous sectarianism. Furthermore, re-baptism was supposed to involve the assumption that the only good people were in the New Church, and that there were no good people in the Old Church. It was assumed, by the opposition, that the doctrine that the Old Church was vastated was interpreted to mean that the Lord is no longer with it, and so re-baptism involved the arrogant claim that the New Church is the sole channel of Divine Grace. These positions were taken with disastrous confusion of thought, and under the pressure of hereditary and sectarian animosities. It has never been claimed deliberately that all good people are in the New Church, or that all in the New Church are good by virtue of formal membership. It is obvious that there are many kinds of good people, and that people may be good in some respects in spite of their false doctrines; on the other hand, it is a sadly recognized fact that people may be bad in some respects in spite of their true doctrines. People who do wrong because of their false doctrines are really bad in that respect, while people who do wrong in spite of their true doctrines are perversely bad in that respect. It does not follow that doctrines are indifferent or negligible, or that one doctrine is as good as another. A man is so far better for having true doctrine, for, at least, it puts him in a position of advantage; he is so far worse for having false doctrine, because it puts him in a position of disadvantage. In short, the Lord operates in man in and through the truth; He cannot operate in him directly in and through what is false. It is therefore man's responsibility to use all available means to get the truth and to avoid what is false.

This controversy over re-baptism, like other controversies in the Church, was due to a lack of understanding the real ground of the distinctiveness of the New Church. The

meaning of New-Church distinctiveness lies in the fact that the Lord has made His Second Coming in the Spiritual Sense of His Word, and that the central and constant teaching of this sense is that the Lord Jesus Christ is the one only God of Heaven and Earth. Another feature of New-Church distinctiveness is that Swedenborg was specially enlightened to see and to promulgate the Spiritual Sense with the doctrines contained therein, which lead to the worship of the Lord in a new way, and consequently to a new way of thinking about Him and of living from Him. These are new and distinctive doctrines. The acknowledgment of these doctrines makes a spiritual communion of those who accept and profess them. The man who professes these doctrines, and lives consistently in the light of them, is a New-Churchman in his individual capacity. Living consistently with them involves joining with others in the common belief, the common worship, and the common life; in this way he becomes one of the organized body of members who in their collective capacity constitute the New Church as a body of common believers, common worshippers, and co-workers. The distinctive religious doctrines make a distinctive Church body. The members are good in so far as they are faithful in doctrine and life. But the Lord has other sheep which are not of this fold; these He also ministers to according to their needs. Those who are faithful are good in their way and measure; those who are not are bad. The Lord is God of the whole earth. He is present to all according to their knowledge and capacity. All men are good in proportion as they love and serve Him; but they love and serve Him in different ways and in different degrees. Men are bad in proportion as they are unfaithful to their obligations to Him. The doctrine that the Old Church is vastated means that it has perverted and abandoned the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, namely, that God is one and that the Lord is that God, that the Bible is His Word, and that a good life is a life of love to Him and for our fellowmen. The first was perverted by the doctrine of

the trinity; the second, by the doctrine that the Bible is the work of men; the third, by the doctrine of salvation by faith alone, that is, by faith in the vicarious atonement. As a result of this perversion, faith in the Lord and in His Word has been abandoned, and men, thrown on their own resources, have become naturalistic and humanistic in thought and conduct, if not in dogma. This vastation, however, does not mean that the individuals are altogether bad. In spite of their false system of vastated doctrine, individuals have remnants of Christian teaching and tradition, which saves them from complete spiritual destruction, and enables them to share in Christian blessings, enables them to receive the Holy Spirit in their measure. Accordingly there are good people in the Old Church as well as in the New, but it is a goodness of a different kind and level. It is not a question whether or not the New Church is the only channel of Divine Grace; it is a question of kind and degree. New-Church baptism is baptism into a new faith and life; Old Church baptism is baptism into a different faith and life. Old Church baptism, therefore cannot be substituted for baptism into the New Church.

In the development of the Church organization, local and partisan interests were involved; and these were intensified by views and sentiments which had their motives in hereditary and traditional habits and prejudices. The constructive work of organization encountered a serious obstacle in the anti-ecclesiastical temper of a large part of the membership of the Church, especially among the western members, who cherished the freedom and individuality of the pioneer life. The real or fancied encroachments of ecclesiastical authority were resented and repelled. The Church was split into three Conventions; the General, the Western, and the Central, centering in Boston, Cincinnati, and Philadelphia respectively. The ecclesiastic dominance of Boston was resented. The Rules of Order sought to be imposed by Boston on the membership of the Church were objected to as restricting too much the freedom of individuals and societies.

The movement to form and adopt a uniform liturgy was resisted on the same ground. But in spite of vigorous obstruction, the progress made in organization and in liturgical construction resulted in the Constitution of the Convention and in the Book of Worship, two of the most signal achievements in New-Church history.

The most serious and far-reaching issue involved in the controversies of the period was the question of the authority of Swedenborg and his Writings. The merits of this question were obscured by controversial interests. The background of the opposition to the authority of Swedenborg was the traditional Protestant contention for the finality of private judgment, which historically was asserted in reaction against the authority claimed by the Roman Catholic Church. This reactionary spirit was aroused by the use of Swedenborg's authority to overpower in debate. In fact, Swedenborg's authority was used both in offense and defense. Authority was claimed for the Convention and for the Church; but the principle of authority was derived from the claim which Swedenborg himself makes, that he was enlightened directly by the Lord as he read the Word, and that he was commissioned by the Lord to write and publish the Doctrines of the New Jerusalem. His authority and the authority of his Writings are grounded in his enlightenment and in his commission. It was in reaction against these claims that the authority was challenged. The opposition and rejection were justified on the ground of the finality of private judgment. One of the prominent leaders of the Church is quoted as saying, "We read Swedenborg for instruction, *not for authority*. . . . His mission should be inferred from perceiving the truth he wrote, and not *vice versa*." The President of Convention in his day was quoted as saying, "As to the authority by which I speak and act, I ask none, but the Lord in His Word." All this amounts to saying, "He wrote the truth, and I am the measure of that truth," which is merely another way of asserting the principle of the finality of private judgment. In

reality, this controversy, aside from the personal and partisan interests involved, was largely verbal. If more interest and effort had been given to understanding what Swedenborg wrote, instead of merely reading the commonplaces of religious and political controversy into his language, the task would have been sufficient to occupy the whole attention, and the question of authority would not have arisen. In other words, if we take the trouble to get the meaning of Swedenborg's statements, and see the truth of them, the demand for authority ceases. Nevertheless, in view of our small ability to get the meaning and see the truth, we need, for the support of our interest and effort, confidence in Swedenborg as a competent writer; and so we need confidence that his statements have a meaning and are true, even if at the moment, or after prolonged effort, we do not get the meaning and see the truth. This is the kind of authority which Swedenborg and his Writings properly have; and it is the kind of authority we usually give to all we have reason to suppose competent. Mrs. Block recites these controversies in her usual matter-of-fact way, but at the same time with evident sympathy with the reactionaries, the anti-ecclesiastics, the anti-formalists, and the latitudinarians.

Chapters VIII, IX, and X are devoted to the Academy Movement and the General Church, with a circumstantial account of the "Conjugial Love" controversy, and other controversies incident to the separation from Convention. It would take us too far afield to discuss these movements on their merits, or on the author's treatment of them. The treatment in general is remarkably sympathetic and constructive, and as such is well worth close study.

As the first five chapters give an account of Swedenborg, the Doctrines, and the growth of the Church, so the last three tell of the present condition, and especially the various disturbing and distressing epidemics which have afflicted the Church and hindered its progress in doctrine, organization, and in community life. The story is told with avowed sympathy with the "liberals." As a matter of course, an

author has the privilege and the responsibility of selecting his own material and choosing his own point of view, but nevertheless he is accountable for his selection and choice, and amenable to critical judgment, especially when he undertakes to describe movements of history. Every historical movement has its own character, and presumably a motive of its own, which establishes the point of view, and gives proper weight to methods, persons, and events. The New Church is a religious movement under the guidance of spiritual principles. These principles determine the point of view and the method of procedure in narrating the history of the Church. That the Lord has made His Second Coming in the spiritual sense of His Word, and that this fact is revealed in Swedenborg's Writings, are the two leading principles which guide the formation and growth of the Church. The fundamental teaching of the spiritual sense is that the Lord Jesus Christ glorified is the one and only God of heaven and earth, and that He alone is to be worshipped. All the Doctrines of the New Church are derived from these principles.

Mrs. Block is in general careful to maintain historical objectivity; but in the selection of her materials she places emphasis on what may be called the sensational features of the story, the disturbances created by disaffected individuals and groups. The constructive and progressive efforts and achievements in the organization of Convention and its functions are comparatively neglected, although the liturgical achievement of the Book of Worship is generously recognized. The history of Convention is viewed in the light of the distinction between "conservative" and "liberal." But the terms "conservative" and "liberal" are misapplied to the individuals and movements in Convention, both because they are too vague, and because they are little more than partisan labels. The constructive and progressive leaders and policies are called "conservative," whereas the reactionaries and the disaffected are called "liberals." The terms need to be defined before they are applied. A conservative may try to keep what is best as a basis for im-

provement, and may proceed gradually and cautiously with constructive effort and achievement; this is measurably true, fairly said, of the body of Convention and its leaders; it is another way of saying that the Convention has been liberal in its temper and in its policies. In a just and true sense, a liberal is one who is first of all what we call a liberally educated man, of broad sympathies and fixed, well-grounded principles. He is tolerant, not because he regards one opinion as good as another, or one action as good as another, but because he thinks others are entitled to their own opinions, and have a right to choose their own courses of action, whether right or wrong. He is hospitable to new views and new measures, but he reserves the privilege of judging them in the light of experience and probable results, and on this basis he approves or rejects. The fact that a man is disposed to take up with whatever is new, and espouse any new cause, is not evidence of liberality, but rather of egotism, narrow-mindedness, and ignorance. Liberality is an achievement, not a mere impulse, however diffusive.

Mrs. Block devotes a whole chapter to "Liberalism in the New Church." It is significant to note that she applies the term to the four radical anti-ecclesiastics, as if anti-ecclesiasticism were sufficient to stamp a man a liberal. It is also significant to note that, when we compare the statements of these "liberals" with those of the Convention representatives, true liberality is found on the side of the latter, unless indeed we identify liberalism with anti-ecclesiasticism, and with latitudinarianism. A contributor to the *Messenger* in 1855 is quoted as an expression of liberalism, and also as an expression of "reaction against the extreme exclusiveness and sectarianism of the early Church." The quotation is: "The New Church should, least of all, be sectarian in spirit, for its doctrines are most catholic and comprehensive, teaching that there are infinite varieties of good and grades of truth, which are by no means confined to particular societies, churches, kingdoms, or nations, but that each has a species of good and a per-

ception of truth in some respects peculiar to itself." This, as an attendance upon Convention for nearly fifty years testifies, is a fair statement of the position of Convention from the beginning, with the qualification that the Convention has never held that one good or one truth is as important as another; it has always maintained itself against the in-roads of indifferentism and latitudinarianism. We are told that "The growth of this new liberalism centers around certain strong personalities, the first of these being the Rev. Benjamin F. Barrett, a former Unitarian minister." Then follow, as exponents of "this new liberalism," the names of George Bush, Henry James, Sr., and C. H. Mann. Professor Bush was a Congregationalist and an anti-clerical radical. Mr. Barrett was an industrious propagandist of some of Swedenborg's Doctrines; but his name was dropped from the Convention roll because of his hostile attitude to the organization and his intemperate language. He was a reactionary of the extreme anti-ecclesiastical type, and a good example of the reaction of Protestant Congregationalism against the Roman Catholic hierarchy. In fighting the Convention he seemed to think that he was fighting the Romish Church. Professor Bush was never an authorized minister of the Convention; he refused ordination as authorized by Convention, but accepted the leadership of the Brooklyn Society with the understanding that he would not be considered a pastor or minister, but only a "brother." This relation was not maintained for long. In short Professor Bush, though an important factor in the intellectual equipment of the Swedenborgian propaganda of the day, had little or nothing to do with the constructive and progressive work of the Convention.

Henry James, a Presbyterian by birth and heredity, was a violent anti-ecclesiastic, and a constant enemy of the organized Church as the "abomination of abominations." He was, however, an ardent advocate of some of Swedenborg's Doctrines as he understood them, and had a narrow but devoted circle of readers and followers in the Church. These followers have too often been critical obstructionists rather

than constructive co-workers, and have in some conspicuous cases withdrawn from the Convention altogether.

Mr. Mann was a disciple and follower of Henry James, and shared his anti-ecclesiastical temper. Although long editor of the *Messenger,* the organ of Convention, he became so offensive to the progressive sentiment of the Church that after serving as editor for twenty-five years he was removed. Soon thereafter he resigned his pastorate of the Orange Society, and went off to Elkhart, Indiana, where he formed a sect of his own. In other words, he severed his connection with Convention altogether.

To class these men as liberals and as the exponents of liberalism in the Convention is to ignore the character of the men and the meaning of the word "liberal," unless we choose to take anti-ecclesiasticism as the characteristic trait of liberalism. If a man chooses to put himself in opposition to all Church organization, that is his privilege; but he ought to be liberal enough and tolerant enough to let others participate in the benefits of Church organization without being subjected to unmerciful and constant attack. These men, of course, have a right to express their opinion freely about ecclesiasticism, or any other feature of Church organization, but they have no just grounds for assuming a position of superiority or liberality. A man is not a liberal merely because he expresses his opinions freely. As a matter of fact, the Convention has always been liberal and tolerant towards the free expression of even hostile opinion, within the limits of decency. Moreover, ecclesiasticism has never been an issue in the constructive and progressive body of the Church. The anti-ecclesiastical sentiment in its extreme form was confined to some reactionaries, who took little part in the progress of the Church. The sentiment was really, in final analysis and original motive, a phase of Congregational reaction against the Catholic and Anglican Church organizations. It may be that the attitude and criticism of the anti-ecclesiastics has modified and restrained the tendency in Convention, on the part of some members at least, to unduly emphasize the importance of organiza-

tion, and consequently has made progress circumspect and secure. So far such criticism has been constructive, not destructive.

It should also be said and insisted that Convention has always been liberal in the sense that it has recognized and welcomed all denominational and religious integrity. It has been true to its doctrine that the Lord's Church is world-wide, inclusive of all who know, acknowledge, love, and serve Him, and that the Lord takes care of all who live in accordance with the principles of their religion. But it has not been willing to commit suicide by making itself a sect, either of the Protestant or the Catholic Church. It has claimed uniqueness and distinctiveness on the ground that it is the Church of the Second Coming, the New Jerusalem described in the Book of Revelation, especially in the spiritual sense. It is this claim that is offensive to those who repudiate any Church organization, and those who think that one denomination is as good as another, which really amounts to the view that all denominations and all Churches are false, vain, and mischievous.

"This anti-ecclesiasticism was, however, only one phase of the rising tide of liberalism. The question of the relation of the New Church to other Churches became a burning question." This issue involved the question, What is the New Church? as well as its relation to other Church bodies. With reference to this question, a paper read by Mr. Barrett in 1880 before the Council of Ministers is cited as a revolutionary statement, to the effect that the New Church is not essentially distinct from the Old, but "a homogeneous continuation of it." Mr. Barrett's statement, and the anti-ecclesiastic temper, really involve the conviction that there is no such thing as the New Church as a distinct Church body. This, of course, is not doing away with the Doctrines of Swedenborg, which may be accepted or rejected as a whole or in part by individuals or groups at pleasure; and this is just what is supposed to be going on in the world at large. This may be what is meant by the New Church as "a homogeneous continuation of the Old."

Here no distinction is made between accepting certain doctrines selected according to taste or fancy, and accepting the body of doctrine as a new revelation. If the New Church were a sect, an offshoot of the Old, merely one more added to the Protestant denominations, Mr. Barrett's statement would be fairly correct, and sad to say too much in agreement with a common view. But the New Church as constituted by the Second Coming of the Lord in the spiritual sense of His Word, and as the outcome of a new body of doctrine about the Lord and His relation to man, is the organized body of receivers of this new dispensation of Divine truth brought to men through the agency of Emanuel Swedenborg, the specially enlightened and commissioned interpreter and herald of this spiritual sense. As such, the New Church is a distinct Church body, related to the Old socially, but distinct doctrinally and spiritually. This distinctiveness is not commonly recognized and understood, and so the claim of distinctiveness is resented, and sometimes vigorously repudiated.

As a signal instance of the kind of reaction against the claim of New-Church distinctiveness so commonly exhibited throughout the history of the Church, it is fitting to cite the Memorial presented by Otis Clapp and ninety-three others to Convention in 1880. We have a lengthy quotation from this Memorial, with the expression of a confident opinion that it was the most important move in the direction of New-Church liberalism, in fact, that it might "well be called the Magna Charta of New-Church liberalism." The Memorial is for the most part and in intent a *protest* against the "seeming antagonism or conscious superiority to other religious bodies," and a *plea* for the removal of "all just grounds for the charge or even the suspicion of narrowness and illiberality," "what (to them) has seemed like a sectarian exclusiveness." This would "regain the affection and confidence of brethren who have been alienated." Inasmuch as the Convention has always maintained an attitude of friendliness and co-operation towards other religious bodies, for lack of specification the protest and plea would

seem to be a reflection upon the attitude of the memorialists towards their fellow New-Churchmen, and it would seem that they have certain *persons* in mind rather than the body of the Convention. It may be that with careful study we may discover the ground of their attitude of superior charitableness and liberality. They condescend to withhold disapproval of "a separate organization based upon the New Doctrines," but they desire especially "that the Convention cease to claim for itself any special prerogatives, any special right to the Christian name or ordinances, or any special efficacy in the latter when administered by its own officials; that it frankly admit (and have its admission promptly recorded) that these ordinances are equally valid, efficacious and significant when reverently administered by Christians of whatever name or creed." Here we have the point of the protest, or at least we are approaching it. If the New Church must surrender the distinctiveness of its ordinances, What functions are left to it? Perhaps worship, and preaching, and teaching; but these must not be distinctive, else our neighbors would be offended, and we would exhibit the spirit of superiority, exclusiveness, and sectarianism, the spirit of illiberality. In short, the memorialists imply that a distinctive New-Church body is an intolerable offense. In this case, what becomes of the new Doctrines upon which the separate organization is based? This view is grounded upon what the New Church is taken to be. The theory of the Memorial is that "There never has been and never can be more than one Church, in the large and comprehensive sense of the term, at any given time, . . . that since the time of the Last Judgment (1757), the New Church, signified by the New Jerusalem, has been and continues to be the only Church on earth; . . . that this Church is much larger and more inclusive than any sect; that it is distinguished less by its beliefs or doctrine than by *righteousness of life*, love to the Lord and the neighbor being its fundamental. . . . Therefore, that members of the New Church are to be found in all existing religious bodies,—and some, doubtless, outside all; for we cannot doubt that there are,

both within and without such bodies, *some* who truly love the Lord and the neighbor; while some who accept the doctrines of this Church, and join the organization bearing its name, may be quite destitute of its heavenly spirit, and in reality constitute no part of it." Something may be said for the discrimination, if not for the charity and liberality of this last statement; but charity and liberality are achievements, not natural possessions.

The above language is a curious but unusual expression as to the nature of the New Church. While it may be true in one sense, it would hardly strike a Roman Catholic, an Episcopalian, a Presbyterian, or a Methodist as clear thinking, or as evidence of liberality. If the New Church is the only Church on earth, then these so-called Churches do not exist, or exist only in the New Church; but this does not seem a very friendly thing to say of them; nor is it very consistent to say that they do not exist, and yet their ordinances are equally valid with those of the New Church. Moreover, if they do not exist, it seems hardly worth while to attempt to regain the affection and confidence of their members. These inconsistencies make the language of this Memorial seem thoughtless, and give it the character of a sentimental pose, which is reactionary and suggestive of the attitude of superiority. But there is, besides the personal concern for public opinion, a rationalized basis for the attitude toward the Church, and it is expressed in terms of the view that the New Church is world-wide, the result of a universal spiritual influx into all men; so that all recipients of this influx are in the New Church. This view is often expressed briefly in the statement that the New Church is comprehensive, and includes all good people both inside and outside existing religious bodies. The idea that the New Church is universal in the sense that it includes all good people of whatever denomination or race is a very seductive one; it seems to have the character of generous and broad-minded appreciation, but it is really the expansiveness and diffusiveness of an undisciplined imagination charged with self-importance and a sense of superiority, quite neglectful

of the actual conditions involved in the nature of the Church and in the nature of man. No doubt the Lord's presence is universal; His love and wisdom extend to all men and all things. But this does not make all men and all things members of his New Church. His love and wisdom are received by all, but not in the same measure and degree. Each man and each thing receives in the measure and degree of the nature and capacity of each. The rocks, the plants, the animals, receive differently. This is expressed in the formula, Influx is according to the nature of the recipient. So men receive according to capacity, that is, according to knowledge and will, and according to the degree of knowledge and will. The Lord is present in all activity, as the Source of the activity. He is present in knowing, willing, and in the consequent doing, in a higher degree and more fully than in other forms of activity. He is present more particularly in the several various qualities and degrees of knowing and willing. He is present, for example, in the knowledge of God, even in a vague idea of God which the so-called heathen have; He is more fully present and in a higher degree in the knowledge of Himself which Christians have from His Word in the sense of the letter. He is still more fully present and in a still higher degree in the knowledge of Him as the glorified Human which New-Churchmen have from the spiritual sense of His Word, and as He is in His Second Coming in that sense. It is this knowledge and the willing and doing in the light of the knowledge that constitutes His New Church, the New Jerusalem. This is His specific Church. In so far as men have this knowledge and live in the light of it, they are in the New Church; but they are not in the New Church without this knowledge. The Lord is, however, present in all who have any knowledge of Him and acknowledge Him, even if it is not a knowledge of Him in His Second Coming in the spiritual sense of His Word; and these constitute His universal Church. The distinction lies in the kind and degree of knowledge, with the willing and doing that go with it. The knowledge of the Lord as given

in the letter of the Gospels, and that given in the spiritual sense of the Gospels, and especially in the spiritual sense of the Book of Revelation, belong to different levels of thought and understanding. The Lord in His Second Coming is not present in those who have no knowledge of His Second Coming; and therefore only those are in the New Church who know and acknowledge Him in the spiritual sense of His Word. It is true that we get some spiritual light when we read the Word reverently, but in this case, apart from a knowledge of correspondences, we interpret the letter figuratively and allegorically. Such interpretation is vague and largely arbitrary, whereas by the law of correspondence the interpretation is clear and definite. In view of the above considerations, it is seen that such statements as, "The New Church is the only Church on earth, and all who love the Lord and the neighbor are in the New Church," are made without due reflection; and if we undertake to apply them in the light of the principles and the actual conditions involved, we see that they are narrow-minded and illiberal, lacking both breadth and light. It is true that in the specific sense the New Church is the only Church on earth; but this does not include or ignore other Christian denominations or other religions. The status of these is determined by the distinction between the specific and the universal Church, and the distinction between the universal Church and the bodies of religion outside the Church. All these are under the Lord's care, His love and wisdom extend to all according to capacity and character.

A characteristic and extreme statement of the universalistic view is quoted by Mrs. Block from an address to Convention in 1884 by "One of the most prominent liberals," in part as follows: "By the New Church, in its origin and seminal principles, we understand a new disclosure of Divine and consequently universal truth, which will constitute a New Age. Regarded abstractly from persons and places, it is a new and more powerful influx of Divine Truth into every degree of creation, and into every created being and thing." Without proper qualifications,

and especially the qualification that the influx is according to the state and capacity of the recipient, this statement would mean that not only every man but every thing is a member of the New Church,—an absurd conclusion. This quotation, however, does not fairly and fully represent the position of the address.

Other illustrations of the progress of "liberalism" in the Church are cited as the growing interest in science, exemplified by the formation and development of the Swedenborg Scientific Association, the history of the *Messenger,* the controversy over the merits and results of "Higher Criticism," and the issue between the "Fundamentalists and the Modernists," the various features of the "Social Gospel" (to which a whole chapter is devoted), and finally the various movements in Convention from 1890 on. These subjects are presented for the most part as historical matters of fact, but in the controversies the author shows partiality for what she calls the liberal side. It would be out of place here to discuss her treatment of the issues, or attempt to discuss the issues on their merit. These issues are too much involved in present controversies, and could not be discussed as matters of history, free from personalities.

The book as a whole, so far as Convention is concerned, might well be called an attempt to trace the development of "Liberalism" in the New Church. There is little apparent interest in the interpretation or appreciation of the Doctrine of the Second Coming, the Doctrine of the Lord, or the Doctrine of the Sacred Scriptures; and yet these are the fundamental and distinctive doctrines of the Church. The other doctrines, however important for practical and intellectual life, are derived from these fundamentals.

We have tried to show that the book is an interesting and valuable contribution to New-Church history, and we recommend it as such. It illustrates the need for a history of the Church with a more central and comprehensive purpose, for New-Church people and for others.

LEWIS F. HITE.

Christmas Cards
Easter Cards
Celebrating the Birth and the Resurrection of Christ

Choice cards both of foreign and of domestic manufacture. Prices of Christmas Cards from 5 to 50 cents; of Easter Cards, 5 and 10 cents. Mail orders solicited, and satisfaction guaranteed.

The Massachusetts New-Church Union

134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THE NEW CHURCH MAGAZINE

The Quarterly Organ of the General Conference of the New Church in Great Britain is the oldest New-Church periodical. It is of great interest to New-Church people in all parts of the world. Subscription price $1.25 per year, postpaid.

Order from the

Massachusetts New-Church Union

134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

SWEDENBORG'S WRITINGS

STANDARD EDITION, 30 vols., dark green cloth, $30.00, or $1.00 per vol. postpaid.

ROTCH EDITION, 32 vols., blue linen buckram, gilt top, $40.00; brown half morocco, full gilt, $125.00; sold only in sets, transportation at cost of purchaser. Separate titles of the Rotch Edition at special prices as shown in booklist sent upon request.

Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.

Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

SUBSCRIBE NOW FOR THE SWEDENBORG STUDENT

The Swedenborg Student is a monthly magazine, edited by Rev. Arthur Wilde, to help in the study of the Writings. It contains also the monthly Bulletin of the Arcana Reading Class.

Subscription price $1.00 per year.

To encourage new members to join the Reading Classes, the Swedenborg Student for one year and the first volume of the "Arcana Cœlestia," Standard Edition, are offered together for $1.50.

SWEDENBORG FOUNDATION
Incorporated

18 East 41st Street **New York, N. Y.**

THE ROTCH TRUST FUND

Mrs. Lydia S. Rotch died in Boston, July 20, 1863, at the age of 80 years. She left $15,000 to be administered by three trustees for the benefit of the Convention. The activity of this Fund, administered by its successive three trustees, has been primarily that of the publication of Swedenborg's Theological Writings, commentaries compiled therefrom, and other works, as follows:

A complete edition of the Theological Works published by Swedenborg.

"The Worship and Love of God."

Commentaries on Matthew, John, Ezekiel and the Psalms.

Selections from Swedenborg, in raised type for the blind.

"Swedenborg, Harbinger of the New Age of the Christian Church," by Benjamin Worcester.

All of these publications are available through the several New-Church book-rooms, to wit:

UNITED STATES.

Akron, Ohio. New-Church Book Room 369 So. Maple St., Room 6.
Baltimore, Md. Swedenborg Book Center, 3812 Barrington Road.
Boston, Mass. Massachusetts New-Church Union, 134 Bowdoin St.
Chicago, Ill. Western New-Church Union, Rooms 1745-6, 17 N. State St.
Cincinnati, Ohio. New-Church Library, Oak Street and Winslow Avenue.
Los Angeles, Calif. New-Church Book Room, 509 So. Westmoreland Ave.
New York, N. Y. Swedenborg Foundation, Inc., 18 E. 41 St., Manhattan.
New-Church Press, 108 Clark St., Brooklyn Heights.
Philadelphia, Pa. New-Church Book Association, 2129 Chestnut St.
San Francisco, Calif. New-Church Library, 1640 O'Farrell St.
St. Louis, Mo. New-Church Book Room, 1215 Sunset Ave.
Washington, D. C. New-Church Library, 16th and Corcoran Street, N.W.
Wilmington, Del. New-Church Book Room, Penn Ave. and Broome St.

CANADA.

Toronto, Ont. Wm. H. Law, 561 Yonge St.

ENGLAND.

London. The Swedenborg Society, and The New-Church Press, Ltd., 20 Hart St., Bloomsbury, W. C. 1.
Manchester. New-Church Book Depot, 34 John Dalton St.
Glasgow, Scotland. Scottish New-Church Library, 229 Woodland Road.

AUSTRALIA.

Brisbane, Queensland. 345 Ann St., near Wharf St.

INDIA.

Bombay. Swedenborg Society of India, A. E. Penn, Sec., 23 Sussex Road, Bombay.

SWITZERLAND.

Geneva. Agence des Publications de la Nouvelle Eglise, 22 Rue de la Confederation.

The Fund assists, from time to time, in other New-Church uses to the extent that it has available funds; for example, the Neighborhood House at Lynn, Mass., to the support of which it regularly contributes. It has also coöperated in the publication of some of Swedenborg's scientific works, and of the photofacsimile reproductions of Swedenborg's theological manuscripts.

The original sum is intact, and the income only is used. This is, of course, entirely inadequate to help all the uses which come before the Rotch Trustees for contributions, including many for which other New-Church funds are not available because of their limitations. It is estimated that since the death of Mrs. Rotch, the trustees have spent over $65,000.00 in various church uses.

Will friends of the New Church continually bear in mind the importance of increasing the Rotch Trust Fund, whether by "giving while living" or by will?

The present Trustees are:

GEORGE C. WARREN, *President*,
CHARLES N. MASON,
JOHN W. HATHAWAY, *Secretary and Treasurer*,
18 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.